DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 293 FL 013 316

AUTHOR	Barrett, Ralph Pat, Ed.
TITLE	The Administration of Intensive English Language Programs.
INSTITUTION	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	82
NOTE	104p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009 (Single copy, $1.00, 5 copies $2.00, 10 copies $3.50, additional copies $0.25).
PUB TYPE	Books (010)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College Second Language Programs; *Curriculum Development; *English (Second Language); *Foreign Student Advisers; Higher Education; Instructional Materials; *Intensive Language Courses; Language Teachers; *Program Administration; Student Adjustment; Teaching Methods; *Testing

ABSTRACT

This collection of essays gives detailed information about the administrative organization, staffing, program, students, testing, and research regarding intensive English programs (IEP). The following essays are included: (1) "Introduction," by R. Barrett; (2) "The General Administration of the IEP," by R. Daesch; (3) "The Selection of Intensive English Students," by R. Dakin; (4) "Advising and the Intensive Course," by A. Bens; (5) "The Amenities, Opportunities, and Conveniences in a New Home," by R. Dixon; (6) "Student Management," by S. Imamura; (7) "Faculty," by D. Eskey; (7) "Curriculum Design and the Selection of Teaching Materials," by B. Taylor; (8) "Student Development in the Intensive English Program," by R. Daesch; (9) "Incorporating English for Specific Purposes Programs into an On-Going Intensive Program," by W. Longenecker; (10) "The ESL Learning Laboratory," by J. Sheehan; (11) "A Guide to References in ESL Methodology for the Intensive Program," by R. Barrett; (12) "Student Evaluation," by P. Angelis; (13) "The Evaluation of an Intensive English Program," by M. Saltzer; and (14) "An ESL Administrator Looks at Research," by P. Munsell. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

The Administration of Intensive English Language Programs

Ralph Pat Barrett, Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
NAFSA
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

FL013 316

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1982

The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs is a nonprofit membership association that provides training, information, and other educational services to professionals in the field of international educational exchange. The membership is composed of more than 4,000 representatives of postsecondary institutions, school systems, community organizations, and educational associations. Members implement Association programs and participate in the determination of policies and activities through the Board of Directors and more than 35 committees, commissions, and special interest groups.

This publication was made possible through NAFSA's Field Service Program with the financial support of the Associate Directorate for Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. International Communication Agency. Since 1963 the Field Service Program has established standards for and strengthened services in colleges and universities and related community organizations through publications, consultations, in-service training, and workshops.

Copies of this book can be ordered from Publications Order Desk, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1860 19th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Copyright © 1982 by National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. All rights reserved.
Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

PREFACE v

OVERVIEW 1

INTRODUCTION. Ralph Pat Barrett 1
THE GENERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE IEP. Richard L. Daesch 7

STUDENTS 11

THE SELECTION OF INTENSIVE ENGLISH STUDENTS. Robert F. Dakin 11
ADVISING AND THE INTENSIVE COURSE. Allis R. Bens 19
THE AMENITIES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND CONVENIENCES IN A NEW HOME. Rebecca G. Dixon 27
STUDENT MANAGEMENT. Shigeo Imamura 33

FACULTY 39

FACULTY. David E. Eskey 39

PROGRAM 45

CURRICULUM DESIGN AND THE SELECTION OF TEACHING MATERIALS. Barry P. Taylor 45
STUDENT DEVELOPMENT IN THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM. Richard L. Daesch 51
INCORPORATING ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES PROGRAMS INTO AN ON-GOING INTENSIVE PROGRAM. William E. Longenecker 57
THE ESL LEARNING LABORATORY. Joseph H. Sheehan 69
A GUIDE TO REFERENCES IN ESL METHODOLOGY FOR THE INTENSIVE PROGRAM. Ralph Pat Barrett 77

TESTING AND EVALUATION 81

STUDENT EVALUATION. Paul J. Angelis 81

THE EVALUATION OF AN INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM. Milton G. Saltzer 89

RESEARCH 99

AN ESL ADMINISTRATOR LOOKS AT RESEARCH. Paul E. Munsell 99

CONTRIBUTORS 107

Preface

This volume came about as a response to the need for detailed information about intensive English programs (IEPs), their administrative organization, staffing, program, students, testing, and research. This need was evidenced by the enthusiastic reception given to the CIEP/ATESL workshops held at NAFSA annual conferences during the last several years. The need for fuller information was also felt from another quarter. Those who served as ESL consultants to universities and colleges under the NAFSA Field Service Program and others who acted as consultants in a less formal capacity (the administrative staff of established IEPs, for example) called for some kind of publication that could be left in their clients' hands after they had given their advice and returned to their own campuses.

It should be noted that up to this time, the best outline of the basic organization of an IEP has been found on pages 5–7 of *Guidelines: English Language Proficiency*, edited for NAFSA by Betty W. Robinett and other ATESL members in 1977. Also, the same information is outlined in the CIEP "Guidelines for Intensive English Programs" which makes up Appendix B of the *Guidelines* mentioned above. Since the present CIEP "Guidelines" are undergoing a complete revision at this time and will soon be out-of-date, they have not been reproduced herein.

Most of the articles for this volume were volunteered by members of CIEP/ATESL, many of whom were or are now the administrative heads of IEPs at their own institutions. The articles submitted were given a minimum of editorial revision for style and content. Hence, rather than being a smooth-reading series of integrated and interlocking chapters, this effort instead has produced a collection of essays. The reader will find that each article is complete unto itself; this has the advantage of allowing the reader to browse among the articles, reading only what seems most relevant at the moment, without any loss of continuity. Also, some overlapping of content will be found, with the fortunate result that important points on the operation

of the IEP tend to appear in more than one article and thus receive a natural emphasis provided by repetition.

Each article should be considered as an individual (and sometimes very personal) statement of fact and informed opinion on IEP administration, as if the author were sitting with the reader over coffee, giving of his or her own experience. And that experience is considerable—this volume represents well over two-and-a-half centuries of the contributors' collective experience with ESL and IEPs!

The editor wishes to acknowledge the generous assistance of the following CIEP/ATESL members in the preparation of this publication: Richard L. Daesch, Francine Stieglitz, and especially Barry P. Taylor, whose many astute editorial comments were greatly appreciated. Georgia E. Stewart, NAFSA's Director of Information Services, put the final editorial touches on the entire manuscript, and for this supreme effort, on behalf of the authors as well as myself, our sincere gratitude.

Ralph Pat Barrett
East Lansing, Michigan
Spring 1982

Overview

Introduction

Ralph Pat Barrett

The intensive English program (IEP) undoubtedly owes its present form (c. 1981) to the archetypal English Language Institute (ELI) at the University of Michigan. The ELI program, which this year is celebrating its fortieth anniversary, was the original training ground for scores of ESL specialists, who learned their trade under the guidance of linguist Charles C. Fries and later under the direction of Robert Lado. As a response to the increasing numbers of international students seeking ESL study here in the United States during the last twenty years, many of these former ELI staff members put their training to good use and established programs of their own throughout the country. It is no surprise, then, that forty years after the founding of the first IEP, we can identify certain common features among the many intensive programs operating today, certain shared characteristics which allow us to say that *this* collection of courses, students, and faculty is an intensive English program and *that* one is not.

What are these common features? First, IEPs all have multileveled programs with respect to English proficiency. All offer ESL study on at least three levels: elementary, intermediate, and advanced. Most have from four to six levels, each with its own set of classes, texts and materials, and teaching techniques. It is usually possible for students to progress sequentially from one level to the next higher level, sometimes spending as much as a year in ESL training in one IEP.

Second, IEPs use some kind of standardized ESL test for initial placement and often as a subsequent measure of progress. Usually these tests are actually a battery of subtests which yield multiple scores for diagnostic purposes. The most widely used of such proficiency tests are the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), the Michigan test, and the CELT (Comprehensive English Language Test).

Third, among the different classes offered by the IEP, there is a recognition of the four major language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Usually there is also a class which recognizes the need for English grammar as a necessary supplement to these four language skills. The amount of emphasis on any one of these skills in the IEP schedule usually depends on the students' proficiency level.

Fourth, the typical IEP is a service unit of a college or university and may be placed within an academic department or higher institutional division (school, college, etc.). However, recently there have been a few independently established IEPs and a number of franchise ESL intensive programs that have had no affiliation with any particular institution of postsecondary education.

Fifth, the IEP has an on-going program year around, allowing students to progress from one level to another without unduly long breaks in their ESL study. IEP sessions are usually tied to the academic calendar of the parent institution (semester, quarter, etc.) with terms ranging from eight to sixteen weeks in length.

Sixth, the typical IEP offers from twenty to thirty hours of ESL instruction per week, for a total of 200 or more hours per session. Some programs with short sessions (six to eight weeks) may of course have fewer total hours while still giving twenty or more hours of classes per week.

Seventh, the IEP makes available to its students a variety of advisement services as well as an initial orientation program. Most offer an on-going orientation program which acquaints the student with campus and community life, and with the expectations of academic study in the U.S.

Eighth, IEP students are adults with high school diplomas, most of whom plan to pursue degree programs in American postsecondary institutions after reaching an adequate level of English proficiency. As for native language, country of origin, and level of English proficiency, the IEP students are a heterogeneous group. The major exception to this would be found in IEPs which deal only with special contract groups, such as, Georgetown University's American Language Institute.

Ninth, an IEP is staffed with a director and core faculty who are professionally trained in teaching English as a second language (TESL) or linguistics and/or have solid teaching, supervisory, and/or administrative experience in the ESL/IEP field. Often the director and core faculty will supervise the teaching of less experienced instructors—usually graduate teaching assistants who are TESL or linguistics majors.

It must be pointed out that as the IEP concept has developed over the years, there have been significant innovations in the curriculum structure, teaching methodology, instructional materials, teaching

media, staffing arrangements, and student evaluation. No doubt some of these will become standard features of the IEP of the 1980s, but for now, the list of features above represents the most salient characteristics to be found in the typical intensive English program at the beginning of the 1980s.

As every IEP director knows, operating a full intensive English program has a lot in common with running a three-ring circus (with results just about as interesting sometimes, too). There are usually two or three problems occurring simultaneously, and the program staff are continually being required to make decisions on an incredible variety of subjects, from admissions policies based on the latest INS rulings to a choice of new ESL materials for reading rate improvement. It is hoped that the reader will find some assistance and some useful suggestions among the articles in this collection.

Each section of this volume deals with one of the aspects of IEP administration, each arbitrarily chosen and arranged in the following manner: "Overview," "Students," "Faculty," "Program," "Testing and Evaluation," and "Research."

The first section, "Overview," contains two articles, the first being this general introduction to the intensive English program. In the second reading, Daesch discusses the different types of relationships the IEP may have to the parent institution and the conditions that should be met for an effective IEP operation. In addition, he notes the primary functions of and services provided by the program, as well as the professional responsibilities of the IEP staff.

In the section on "Students," Dakin begins by pointing out some alternative considerations regarding the recruitment of IEP students, the institutional admissions policies applied to them, and the desirability of achieving a balance of national and language backgrounds among the students. Next, Bens stresses the importance of a comprehensive advising program for IEP students, pointing out that this involves advising on immigration, academic, and personal matters. She recommends that the program administrator be thoroughly familiar with the structure of an advising program and know what qualities to look for in a good student adviser. Dixon then describes the support services which an IEP can provide to help make the student feel comfortable and secure while studying in the program. She discusses a number of support areas, including student housing, health insurance, the student's right to privacy, and appropriate campus and community programming. Imamura closes this section with an insightful article about a number of IEP problems that stem from certain unacceptable patterns of student behavior. Among these are the student's failure to register for recommended IEP classes, absenteeism, and tardiness. He also offers some sound advice on handling potential problems that may occur in the classroom.

In the third section on "Faculty," Eskey focuses attention on the ESL teacher, whose day-to-day performance in the classroom provides the "single best measure of program quality and the ultimate success of any language teaching program." Further, he discusses the issues involved in faculty staffing, supervision, and in-service training.

The fourth section, "Program," contains five articles on various aspects of program development. Taylor begins with a careful examination of the interrelation between the design of the IEP curriculum (the form and content of the ESL classes) and the selection of teaching materials for that curriculum. Daesch follows with an observation that the student orientation program of the typical IEP leaves much to be desired in the way of scope, effectiveness, and allotted program time. As a remedy he proposes a model for a "student development" course to be incorporated into the IEP curriculum. An article by Longenecker offers a case study of the organizational changes that his IEP effected as a result of a decision to integrate programs in English for Specific Purposes with the regular IEP courses. Next, Sheehan discusses the scope of the "learning laboratory," a concept which includes the traditional language laboratory with all its hardware and software. Sheehan gives special attention to types of laboratory equipment as well as to the selection of laboratory personnel. He also includes an inventory of new developments in media and their applications to teaching in the learning laboratory. Barrett concludes the section with a list of popular texts on ESL methodology which could form the core of an IEP staff library as well as be of use in curriculum planning and in-service teacher training.

In the "Testing and Evaluation" section, Angelis opens by noting the need for student evaluation in the IEP. He tells of some typical types of tests and testing functions, and gives a brief description of some of the major tests in use today. Lastly, he offers a number of guidelines for the implementation of a testing program for the IEP. In the second article, Saltzer suggests three aspects of program evaluation, derived from fiscal, administrative, and academic criteria. Using these criteria, he looks at the problem of evaluation from the viewpoint of the program's supervisory unit, the program's own administration and faculty, the IEP students, and an external agency.

In the final section, "Research," Munsell suggests a number of reasons why research projects in an IEP might appear to be a difficult undertaking. Therefore, he offers a list of helpful recommendations to the IEP administrator who is considering doing IEP-related research. He concludes with some suggestions for areas that might be profitably researched.

Almost 300 years of experience in IEP programming has gone into the writing of the articles described above. Nevertheless, the spirit in

which they are offered to you, the reader, is one of sharing that experience rather than of articulating dogma. The contributors have learned much the hard way; it is their collective hope that through these articles, your path ahead will be made smoother and the wrong turn will be avoided. In return, perhaps you would use the time saved in finding even better ways to teach English as a second language—intensively.

The General Administration of the IEP

Richard L. Daesch

The intensive English program of a university or college can have a variety of workable administrative relationships within the parent institution. These relationships can be broadly categorized as autonomous or integrated. The autonomous administrative relationship is one in which the governance of the intensive English program over matters of academic policy, programs, budget, and personnel is independent from official involvement of other academic departments, such as English, linguistics, or foreign languages. As an autonomous unit, the intensive English program can have its own administration and faculty which report to an academic dean at the college level of administration or to some other designated college or university official.

An integrated administrative relationship is one in which the governance of the intensive English program over matters of academic policy, programs, budget, and personnel is connected with a department or division. The most frequently cited departments or divisions to which intensive English programs are attached are the departments of English and linguistics, and the divisions of continuing education and international education.

In reality, there are probably very few totally autonomous programs and very few totally integrated programs. Intensive English programs can function successfully under either system of governance or by devising arrangements whereby lesser or greater degrees of autonomy and integration are adopted relative to matters of governance. For example, many directors and faculty are cross-appointed, devoting a percentage of their time to the intensive English program and the remainder to another department. At the same time, where cross-appointments occur, the budget of the intensive English programs may remain totally independent.

Given the organizational structure, whatever it may be, it is important that this structure offer students in the intensive English program the benefit of university facilities, services, and extracurricular activities, and provide administrators and faculty of the intensive English program with the capacity to develop professionally through associations with colleagues in other disciplines.

In short, the conditions which should be met for the effective operations of an intensive English program on a college or university campus are as follows:

1. There should be a strong institutional commitment to international education on the college or university campus.
2. The role and scope of the intensive program within the university should be clearly defined.
3. The intensive program should function as a part of the college or university and have ready access to the benefits of association with the parent institution.
4. The faculty of the intensive English program should have the same rights and privileges as the tenure-accruing departmental faculty at the same institution.
5. The intensive program should be continuous with a stable base of funding and personnel.

The intensive English program operates within the college or university community it serves, within the community and region in which the college or university is located, and within the ESL/EFL profession. As a unit on the campus of a college or university, the primary purposes of the intensive English program are to teach college-bound foreign students the English language and to provide them with an orientation to college life and culture in the U.S. In addition, the faculty and administration of the intensive English program serve as advisers to and/or partners with other agencies on campus which serve foreign students, such as the admissions office, office of international education, academic departments, and the office of student affairs. Some of the other services which can be performed by the intensive English program for the university community are:

1. To provide English proficiency testing
2. To interpret student scores on standardized tests of English
3. To administer oral interviews for prospective foreign graduate teaching assistants
4. To offer additional English study for students already admitted to the university but who lack the required proficiency in English
5. To provide supervised teaching experiences for master's and doctoral students of EFL/ESL
6. To facilitate cultural exchanges between foreign students and Americans

In the community the intensive English program can consult and cooperate with churches, elementary and secondary schools, and the adult foreign population in offering or developing programs for children, wives of students, or heads of households needing to improve their English.

Finally, the intensive English program, through its faculty, has the responsibility to augment the profession through research, publication, and participation in national organizations and conferences. Therefore, faculty of intensive English programs should be provided the time and funds to actively engage in research involving applied as well as theoretical questions of concern to the profession and to present their findings at regional and annual conferences concerned with the teaching of English as a second language.

Students

The Selection of Intensive English Students

Robert F. Dakin

Introduction

Rather than make specific recommendations regarding the selection of intensive English students, this article, for the most part, attempts to identify some possible alternative procedures that administrators of intensive English programs should be aware of in making decisions concerning recruitment and admission of their students.

The concerns addressed herein are those concomitant with the administration of a year-round IEP established in a college or university setting and characterized by a number of common features (see "Introduction"), although the precise nature and organization of these may vary from program to program. Naturally, the discussion that follows will not be relevant to certain types of programs, regardless of their curriculum or intensity of instruction. One IEP, for example, might be established, usually by contract and to continue for a specified period of time, to serve a particular group of students whose native language and ultimate objectives are similar. Another example is the IEP which serves, and whose enrollment is limited to, students who already have regular academic admission to the institution at which the IEP is located. For such programs the selection of students is predetermined by the organization which the contract program is established to serve or by the admissions policy of the parent institution.

Most intensive English programs, however, are not so limited with respect to the students they serve. Insofar as selection and admission status of students is concerned, two somewhat different types of programs can be identified. One is the IEP established primarily as an

English language institute to serve any student having need of such instruction, but admission to which grants the student absolutely no status of regular academic admission to the parent institution. Students in an IEP of this type are admitted as special students for intensive English study only. The program may give preference in admission to students anticipating regular academic study, and may even limit admission to those who already have provisional admission at some institution of postsecondary education. More typically, however, they have an open admissions policy and accept any student who satisfies certain age and education requirements.

In contrast are programs established to provide necessary instruction in English for students academically admitted to the parent institution, but which also serve as general English language institutes and admit special students for study in the IEP only. These programs are similar in some ways to those which serve only students with academic admission to the parent institution, and similar in other ways to those general admission programs in which all students have only special IEP admission status.

Administrators of this combination type of IEP have little control over the initial selection of some of the students enrolled. This is largely determined by the college or university admissions policy. The administrators of such IEPs must, however, of necessity be intimately familiar with this admissions policy, and sometimes may be asked for advice regarding its operation. Above all, they must maintain close and constant liaison with the office of admissions in order to have the information necessary to project probable enrollment from course to course. The responsibility for on-arrival proficiency testing of students with conditional academic admission to the parent institution is usually delegated to the IEP staff. In a sense, then, by determining in this way which students are required to enroll in the intensive English program and at what level, the administrator becomes directly involved in the selection of even the students who do have regular academic admission.

In the usual sense of the term, however, selection of students is commonly understood to mean the recruitment and admission of individuals admitted as special students for study in the IEP only, and it is this administrative responsibility which is the focus of this article. At least three separate but related aspects of this general procedure can be readily identified. Two of them can be rather obviously and easily designated: *recruitment*—giving the program visibility and attracting applicants, and *admission*—establishing criteria and procedures for admitting students. The third—achieving a student population as heterogeneous as possible—is for the purpose of discussion here designated as *balance*.

Recruitment

Although it is immediately obvious that efforts made to attract applicants for admission to an intensive English program must be concordant with earlier decisions about whom the program plans to serve and its established criteria for admission, the first active step in the process of attracting students is to make the existence of the IEP and its potential for service known to prospective applicants. There are a number of ways to do this.

First and most obvious is the preparation of a promotional brochure. Probably the best advice to the administrator of a newly established program or one in the planning stage is to examine and study the brochures of a number of well-established and successful programs. This suggestion does not imply slavish imitation but rather an effort to determine the kinds of information these programs have found by experience is productive in terms of applicant response.

A second important step is to assure as soon as possible that a description of the program's service is included in publications designed specifically to provide prospective applicants with information about available English programs. The Institute of International Education guidebook *English and Orientation Programs in the United States*, published every two years, is the most important of these and is distributed world-wide. There are also commercial publications which charge a fee for a listing. Their regional distribution is more limited, but typically they offer the advantage of including descriptions in the language of the country or area in which they are distributed.

A third way to bring the program to the attention of potential students and sponsoring agencies is to advertise, and some programs regularly follow this practice. Advertising, in the meaning intended here, implies a variety of procedures. Probably the most productive effort is direct mail distribution of copies of the program brochure and other pertinent information concerning the IEP and its parent institution. Such mailings can be directed both to agencies that have responsibility for actual placement of students for English study and to offices which merely disseminate information to individuals planning to study in the U.S. The former are most commonly located in the U.S., but some have overseas branch offices, and there is a growing number of agencies abroad that act as placement brokers for students from the country in which they are located. The offices and agencies that disseminate information and offer advice but do not arrange actual placement (although sometimes they provide a large amount of direct assistance) are located abroad.

Placement agencies are of several types. There are the nonprofit organizations whose professional concern is international educational exchange and which serve by arranging and administering edu-

cational programs for many different groups of students. The Institute of International Education (IIE) and the America-Mideast Educational and Training Services (AMIDEAST) are examples. A much larger group of agencies, which vary greatly in the number of students they have responsibility for placing, are the embassy-based offices of educational attachés or the student bureaus established by some nations. A number of different scholarship programs also place students for English study. The Fundacion Gran Mariscal de Ayacucho (FGMA), which serves Venezeulan students, the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU), and the African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD) are typical examples.

In addition to agencies and organizations of the types mentioned above, there are many commercial and industrial firms that sponsor English study and arrange placement for their employees. These may be foreign nationals employed by overseas branches of American firms or they may be employees of foreign firms. Company-sponsored students are quite commonly self-placed, although some companies arrange the placement for their employees.

An IEP administrator desiring to compile a mailing list of agencies, organizations, and firms for the purpose of inviting student placement can consult larger and longer established programs for suggestions. However, despite the activities of the agencies and organizations mentioned, large numbers of international students needing the services of an IEP are self-placed. They most commonly seek assistance from offices that disseminate information concerning educational institutions in the U.S. Examples are the educational attachés of American embassies, U.S. consulates, ICA offices, and Fulbright commissions. IEP brochures sent to such offices are distributed at no charge to prospective students. Programs listed in the IIE *English and Orientation Programs* publication may in fact be invited by these offices to supply brochures for this purpose, just as they may similarly be invited to supply brochures to the overseas offices of IIE, AMIDEAST, and a variety of placement brokers.

Possibly one of the most effective ways to bring a program and its services to the attention of major placement agencies is by personal contact. Most are institutional members of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), and their representatives quite regularly attend NAFSA annual conferences. Even more effective is a visit to the headquarters of an agency, for this makes it possible to meet not only placement directors or coordinators but also those who have direct personal responsibility for supervision and direction of the educational programs of a particular group of students. A student's program director often has responsibility for placement for English study. In the larger agencies there may therefore be a number of people who need as much information as possible about a large

number of IEPs. Personal visits are welcomed and often provide details and immediately current information which a program brochure cannot do.

In recent years it has become a rather common practice for placement coordinators and program supervisors to place their students for English study at an institution that offers the student's intended degree program. This is done with the obvious hope that a follow-up application for regular academic admission will be successful and that the transition from intensive or semi-intensive English study to degree study will be easier for all concerned. IEP administrators are well advised, therefore, to make themselves familiar with the major curricula and the admission standards and policies of their parent institutions and to disseminate this information to placement agencies along with information about the English program, or at least be able to respond knowledgeably to inquiries concerning regular academic placement.

Admission

Almost without exception, successful IEPs have established admissions criteria regarding minimum age, previous education, and previous study of English. Some programs have established requirements regarding an applicant's admission status as a prospective student in an institution of postsecondary education in the U.S. These criteria must be clearly and specifically stated in the program brochure.

There seems to be consensus that to be admitted to a college or university-based IEP a student must be at least seventeen years of age and a high school graduate. Applications, or at least inquiries, are sometimes made on behalf of students as young as fourteen or fifteen. However, most programs are unwilling to assume an *in loco parentis* responsibility for students this young, even if the prospective student would be living with an older family member. Some also believe it inappropriate for adolescents of this age to be enrolled in classes with adult students. A relatively recent phenomenon, common in some locations, is the application by nonimmigrant students who have one or more years of high school to complete. These applicants plan to attain proficiency enough to permit them to enroll in a high school in the U.S. to complete their secondary education, usually with the intent to pursue postsecondary education in an American college or university. Some IEPs apply their admissions criteria rigorously and refuse to consider these applicants. Some do grant admission, but only after determining that the adolescent student will be living with someone who has the authority of legal guardianship, as determined by the laws of the state in which the IEP operates. The IEP may also require a statement of willingness to admit the student from a high school

authorized to issue Forms I-20. In general, administrators of an IEP should consider carefully the implications and possible problems (for example, parental approval for emergency medical treatment in the event of accident or serious illness) attendant on the admission of non-high school graduate juvenile students.

Many English programs do not pretend and indeed are usually not prepared to provide absolute beginning instruction in English as a second or foreign language. They therefore do not knowingly admit students who have not had prior study of English. Probably the most common criterion for admission is at least two years of high school English instruction. Regardless of the length of prior English study reported, the pre-admission information is often not a reliable indicator of an applicant's readiness for productive study in a monolingual intensive English course. A report of a pre-admission evaluation of achieved proficiency by the TOEFL or other means would possibly be of use. However, because of time constraints and other problems such a report is rarely required by IEPs.

Probably the major decision which must be made by an IEP's governing body is whether to adopt a policy of open admissions or one of limited admissions. Open admissions as used here refers to a policy that permits admission of any applicant who satisfies the criteria of age, education, and prior English study. Limited admissions refers to a policy that permits admission only of applicants who already have at least provisional admission for post-IEP degree study or non-degree technical training at an institution in the U.S. IEPs that adopt a limited admissions policy usually make two exceptions—they admit students at the request of a sponsor or placement agency which also has assumed responsibility for arranging regular academic placement and they admit career professionals who plan only a limited period of intensive English study before returning to their home countries to resume their occupational activities.

There are certain advantages and disadvantages to each type of admissions policy. An IEP that practices an open admissions policy will receive a much larger number of applications from self-placed, privately supported (i.e., nonsponsored) students. Depending upon the administrative affiliation of the IEP at its parent institution and its method of fiscal support, the greater number of applicants may be greatly advantageous. For smaller, less well-known or less well-established programs it may indeed be a necessity. At the same time the assumption of visa sponsorship for a rather large number of students who do not yet have even provisional admission for post-IEP study creates a problem. These students are most typically recent high school graduates seeking admission as college or university freshmen. Also quite typically they have little or no knowledge of how or where to apply for regular academic admission. Their efforts to gain

admission and a Form I-20 from another institution before the duration of stay on their Form I-94 expires sometimes verge on the frantic. The IEP administration and staff inevitably become involved in an immensely time-consuming effort of assisting these students to find appropriate academic placement. Or, alternatively, the IEP is faced with a plea for readmission for continued English study when the program may not have an appropriate sequential level of study that warrants a legitimate readmission.

A limited admissions policy results in a much smaller number of applications from self-placed students, but it eliminates almost entirely the problem and responsibility just described. The IEP staff can devote their eforts to instruction and the students to the mastery of English, without the distraction caused by worry about gaining admission for regular academic study.

There is a second advantage to a limited admissions policy. It almost automatically assures that the applicant who has already received provisional academic admission, or who has been screened by an agency of his government or a scholarship program, will be of an appropriate age for admission and will have the required prior education and English study as well. The IEP can admit the applicant at the request of the placement agency (or on receipt of a copy of a Form I-20 or other written evidence of provisional admission) and not require submission of further academic credentials. The foregoing statements are not intended as a recommendation for either an open or limited admissions policy or for the adoption of any specific criteria. A policy and criteria must be adopted by each IEP after considering whom it wishes to serve and in what ways, its fiscal base, its curricula, and its own traditions.

Balance

There are certain undeniable pedagogical advantages in having a group of ESL students who are all speakers of the same native language. Some IEPs establish language-homogeneous sections for oral-aural instruction and practice even though students are grouped otherwise for classes focusing on written language skills. Nevertheless, there is consensus among IEP administrators and teachers that it is desirable to achieve the most heterogeneous student population possible and that the pedagogical advantages of a balanced mix of students from many different cultures speaking many different languages outweigh those of homogeneity.

The advantages of comparison and contrast, and the sharing of cross-cultural views and information are immediate and obvious as topics and vehicles for both oral and written practice in English. The greater the variety of native languages, the more communication in

English as the only common language occurs, and the more probable is informal communicative practice. At smaller institutions or on campuses where the international student population is relatively small, an IEP with a balanced enrollment can help greatly to achieve a desired cosmopolitan atmosphere. A heterogeneous enrollment makes less likely the possibility that a large group of students from a certain area will request special treatment or demand ill-considered and undesirable changes in the content or method of the program. The arguments for a heterogeneous IEP enrollment are numerous, and experienced ESL professionals could add to the list above.

Unfortunately it is easier to make a case for balance in an IEP enrollment than it is to achieve it. However, at least two things can be done by those responsible for the recruitment and admission of students. The first and most obvious is to emphasize recruitment efforts in the countries or areas from which numbers of IEP students regularly come to the U.S., but from which the program receives infrequent applications. This may be done by giving the program more in-country visibility. It may be accomplished through efforts to encourage placement agencies serving the desired students to place larger numbers of them with the program. Since these agencies typically prefer not to place too great a number of their students in the same program at the same time, an invitation from a program which has few or none may be quite effective.

A second procedure, probably best practiced simultaneously with the one suggested above, is to establish quotas that limit the admission of students from countries, areas, or native language backgrounds that tend to provide the overwhelming percentage of the program enrollment. Some programs view the establishment of formal quotas with unease as being contradictory to their institution's announced policy of admission of qualified students without regard to race, creed, or nationality. However, in the final analysis it seems that a quota, which limits numbers but does *not* deny admission to any group of students *in toto*, is defensible, particularly in view of the unique nature of an intensive English program and the generally accepted validity of the reasons for attempting to achieve heterogeneity.

Advising and the Intensive Course

Allis R. Bens

The newly arrived foreign student has more need of a strong advising program than foreign students who have been in this country for several years. Because new students face the problems of culture shock, decisions about an academic future, and confusion over immigration procedures, they will often have difficulty concentrating on their initial goal—improving language proficiency—so that the final goal, an academic or vocational degree, may be reached. Therefore, a language institute should develop a comprehensive advising program for its students. Such a program should include at least the following components:

1. Immigration advising
2. Academic advising
3. Personal advising

A program administrator should be aware of such concerns as:

1. Problem areas in an advising program
2. Structure of such a program
3. Qualities necessary in an adviser

Immigration Advising

Advising on immigration requires keeping accurate records and making sure that students are following immigration regulations. Because of language problems, students may not understand the information they have been given in their home countries or upon arrival in this country. It is also possible that well-meaning friends or relatives have given them misinformation which could result in jeopardizing their status. The adviser should keep a file on each advisee with pertinent information such as passport number, visa number, type of visa, the date of passport expiration, country of birth, country of citizenship, I-94 number and the date on which the student's permit to stay expires. The adviser should be concerned with students' vacation plans if those

plans entail leaving the United States. For example, a student who has a single entry visa and goes to Mexico or Canada for a weekend will have problems returning to this country. Some students want to bring wives and/or children after they have been in this country for a few weeks. The adviser will need to help the student with the necessary paper work involved.

The adviser will need to understand regulations regarding work permits and advise students about working. Although a full-time student in an intensive program should not require a work permit, since working is likely to interfere with studying, it may occasionally be necessary.

Additionally, advisers need to be able to inform students who wish to change schools once they have arrived in the U.S. of the proper forms to file and the possibility that the transfer may be denied if the student cannot show good reason for transfer or if the immigration office determines that the transfer would not be appropriate for the student's professed goal. The adviser should have access to *Adviser's Manual of Federal Regulations Affecting Foreign Students and Scholars* published by NAFSA.

Academic Advising

The amount of academic advising required will depend on the admission procedures of the language institute. Some programs only admit students who will be entering the parent institution. These students will need very little academic advising until they are ready to become regular students. Other programs admit students who have conditional admission to any academic or vocational institution. These students will need some help in filling out final application forms, forwarding information on progress in English language proficiency, and understanding the conditions of admission. Problems may arise if the students change their goals and the conditional admission is no longer appropriate, if the students appear to be unable to reach the required proficiency in English, or if they decide that the institution is not appropriate because of personal reasons. It is the adviser's responsibility to determine the validity of the students' requests in terms of immigration regulations.

Some intensive courses admit students for English only with no assurance that the student is admissible to an academic institution. In this case, the advising responsibilities are much greater. The adviser must be aware of what institution would be appropriate for the student, what the admission requirements are, and the deadline for admission. The students should be trained to write for application materials and to fill them out (in pencil) before bringing them to the adviser. After going over the forms together, the students should do the final work

themselves. One of the goals of the adviser is to help the advisees become independent in the new culture. This can be done with guidance.

Personal Advising

Some students require more personal advising than others. Some will not seem to need any; however, the student who never discusses personal problems may be the student who needs the most help. Several techniques may be used to encourage students to share their problems. One technique is to require students to keep a journal or a diary which is turned in to the adviser once a week. It is read by the adviser, corrected only if the student and adviser desire, and the adviser may write a response to what the student wrote. The student must be assured that the journal is a confidential communication between the student and adviser; shy students may express concerns in the journal that are difficult to talk about. Another technique is to have periodic meetings of the advisees. For example, it is a good idea to hold a meeting at the beginning of the intensive course to fill out forms and to discuss rules of the program governing attendance and classroom behavior. Another meeting could take place about the time of mid-term reports, and a final meeting could be held near the end of the intensive course for taking care of final paper work such as forms necessary for transfer, forwarding addresses, requests of Forms I-20 for travel, and requests for letters of recommendation and transcripts. These group meetings tend to give students a sense of being a part of a group with common problems. Another, more time-consuming technique is to make individual appointments halfway through the intensive course. An appointment made for a student may seem more threatening than one the student makes so it would be wise to use a sign-up sheet for these visits.

Culture Shock

In addition to these methods of having contact with advisees, a support program of on-going orientation is effective in solving minor problems. Newly arrived students forced to function in a language in which they are not proficient and a culture with which they are not familiar are likely to suffer from culture shock. This shock is the set of feelings and anxieties one experiences when everything familiar is removed and unfamiliar symbols and signals are substituted. In their own cultures the students would know how to get help in finding suitable housing, food, and transportation. They would know the structure and vocabulary they need to ask the questions which would elicit information that was satisfying. They would know how to approach people who could help them. They would know whether to shake

hands, bow, stand, sit, make light conversation before getting to the problem, when to smile, when to arrive, and when to leave. In the new culture they do not understand the system. They are unfamiliar with rules regarding renting: leases, first and last months' rent, security deposits, cleaning fees, responsibility for gas and electric service, and telephone deposits. They may never have made their own beds, cooked a meal, cleaned a stove or refrigerator, or performed any household tasks.

Frequently students feel that these feelings of isolation and strangeness would be solved by finding a typical American family to live with. This family, of course, would consist of a father who works, a mother who stays home, and two children who would become the student's surrogate brother and sister. It is almost impossible for students to realize that the typical family in the United States is not the one they read about in their high school English textbook. They may find that renting a room does not entitle them to maid service, hours of free English conversation, and food prepared to please their palates. The adviser should try to point out the problems to be found in housing. The dormitory may also create problems for the student. Food will be one of the greatest shocks, but shock may also come from an American roommate whose values, study habits, and personal habits are not the same as the foreign student's. The foreign student needs someone to talk with during these early adjustments to the new culture. The adviser is frequently that person and must be prepared to help the students see that there are two sides to most problems.

Another possible area of culture shock is the instructional program. Most of the students have come from cultures where rules of attendance and behavior are very clearly defined. The students know where they stand and what they must do to fit into the system. In the new culture they are beset by uncertainty unless the structure of the new program is made very clear. Firm rules which are enforced help them to have a sense of security. At one time a student said to me, "Do you know that in "x" program they allow students to be absent for 35 hours?" I confessed that I was not aware of those rules and asked the student what he thought of them. He responded, "Well, they don't care."

Students are frequently surprised at their placement in a level. The level may seem too high, but usually it seems too low. Perhaps in their own schools they were considered to be at the top of their class. They may have received high grades in English and felt that in coming to the United States a brief exposure to intensive English training would be sufficient before beginning academic work. They may feel that the only way to make rapid progress is to be in the highest level. Once again, friendly but firm guidance is needed to help the bruised egos adjust to their fate.

Another area where advising is frequently needed is in the relationships between foreign students and their American counterparts. The students have left an environment where they had family and friends. They have entered an environment where they have neither. The adviser is often cast in the role of mother or father, but who can be cast in the role of friend? Their peers in the intensive course may not fill the requirements either because they speak the student's language and do not provide opportunities for English conversation, or they do not speak the student's language and the student can't understand their English. Furthermore, the term "friend" is difficult to translate because of its cultural implications. It is hard to remember how friendships were formed in their own cultures, how long it took to establish those meaningful relationships. It is also difficult to know which people would make suitable friends without the guidance usually provided by parents and friends. It is very difficult for students to realize they may be intruding on others' friendships which existed long before their arrival. They may also have come from cultures where boy-girl relationships were very restricted. They may react to the freedom in this culture with distaste and fear, or perhaps will act like children in a candy store who want to sample all of the wares. They may misinterpret a smile and a friendly hello as an invitation to a deeper involvement. The sensitive adviser must act as a guide, but not interfere in this search for friends.

One more area of early culture shock is illness, real or imagined. Foreign students who have not been exposed to the same viruses we have tend to get colds and flu more frequently during their initial stay in the new culture than they will after having been here for a year or more. A headache or a stomach upset is frequently a symptom of culture shock brought on by the inner stress the student feels. A headache becomes an incurable brain tumor, a stomach upset surely an ulcer or cancer. Helping the student to understand these problems is another task of the adviser in an intensive course.

Problem Areas for the Adviser

Some of the problem areas in an advising program can be avoided, but some may arise in spite of careful planning. An adviser may develop antagonism toward an individual or a cultural group, thereby becoming unable to deal effectively with that individual or students from that culture. The adviser may become bored with recurring problems and begin to treat them with less concern. The adviser may err by giving advice to another adviser's student and undermining work that has been done or is in progress.

All of the problems do not arise with advisers. Advisees can create problems too. They may ask to change advisers because they feel their

friends are getting better advice. They may go independently to another adviser when they know their own adviser is out of the office. They may try to get special favors by bringing gifts. To avoid problems there should be firm guidelines for advisers and strong support from the administrative staff.

Planning the Advising Program

How does one set up an advising program that will take care of the needs of the student in an intensive course? There is no one solution since intensive courses vary greatly. The ideal program is one where all aspects of advising are taken care of within the intensive course: personal advising, immigration procedures, and academic advising. Such a program can be handled by one person who is a full-time foreign student adviser. More typically it is done by the director and the core staff who are given advising assignments as part of their duties. Another possibility is to have the foreign student adviser of the parent institution handle all immigration procedures while the director and core staff deal with the academic and personal advising. The reason for recommending that all advising be done within the intensive course is that it is easier for one person to deal with the whole. Usually one adviser can handle about twenty-five students with between three and five office hours each week. The students should be taught to sign up for appointments, to keep the appointments and return if necessary. A danger in having different advisers for one student is the propensity of some students to ask a number of people the same question until they get the answer that pleases them. That answer, right or wrong, becomes the true answer.

When an intensive course is planned, guidelines should be established even when there are only one or two advisers. A long-term plan should include procedures for increasing the advising staff as the enrollment increases.

Adviser Qualifications

What are the qualifications for an adviser? What are some of the guidelines which should be given? It would be desirable to have advisers who have lived in other cultures and experienced culture shock themselves. Advisers should be able to live comfortably with the role of guide and to know their own shortcomings. Advisers should be knowledgeable and willing and able to learn about immigration procedures, cultural problems, and the academic world. Finally, here are ten guidelines for advisers in an intensive program:

1. Do not become emotionally involved with advisees.

2. Know when a problem is beyond your ability to handle and when to seek professional help. (Psychiatrist, medical doctor, immigration lawyer, etc.)
3. Be friendly but firm.
4. Do not make value judgments or attempt to impose your values on your advisees.
5. Do not be afraid of silence. Let the student talk while you listen.
6. Do not speak the student's language in an effort to improve your own proficiency in that language.
7. Know when to call an end to an advising session.
8. Do not prejudge a student because of cultural background.
9. Do not promise anything you cannot do.
10. Do not show favoritism for any individual or cultural group.

After a number of years of advising students there will be few surprises left. The adviser may encounter students with venereal disease, unmarried students who announce "I'm like a lady with a baby," students arrested for shoplifting and speeding, married students who become involved with American girls, students with mental problems requiring psychiatric care, and students involved with cheating on exams, plagiarism, drugs, and alcoholism. These guidelines have been an attempt to present a view of the advising program through a clear lens. A rose-colored view of the foreign students, the adviser, and the advising process will surely result in a weak program which provides inadequate support for the newly arrived student. The foreign student is not Horatio Alger, Hyman Kaplan, or Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm, nor is the adviser a modern day god.

The Amenities, Opportunities, and Conveniences in a New Home

Rebecca G. Dixon

Certain everyday matters become insurmountable barriers to enjoyment and peace of mind when a person encounters them without the security of language proficiency and knowledge of the possible and acceptable action or response. In order to alleviate some of this potential uneasiness, the intensive English program should offer the new student help in certain important areas. This article is concerned with some of those areas: housing, insurance, rights to privacy, knowing one's campus, and knowing one's community.

Housing

That careful consideration must be given to the housing needs of the intensive English program student is apparent; however, each program faces different possibilities for housing its students. Whatever the options, the students need to understand what the rules are. Each institution knows what the limitations or opportunities for housing international students on its campus or in its community are and will try to make the most of the opportunities and seek ways of compensating for limitations. There are some situations that should be avoided if at all possible.

Primary among these is having the international students segregated in any way. A block of rooms or a floor in a dormitory may be the easiest to administer; however, it may lead to the most difficulties for the students who need all the opportunities for meeting native speakers, making friends, and feeling wanted that a housing arrangement can yield.

Pairing native speakers with non-native speakers in the dormitory does not guarantee friendship, improved English, or a built-in instruc-

tor for the language student. In fact, the forcing of such combinations may result in more difficulties than the advantages that may result.

Probably the most helpful service the intensive English program can provide for its students is guidance in what is expected of a roommate or apartment mate—how space is established; how the cleaning, cooking, and paying of bills is shared; how a washer/dryer is used—in short, all of those things that make living together a pleasure and not an aggravation.

This can be done by an orientation at the beginning of a term or by a handbook of do's and don't's; but these fail when the language of the orientation or the handbook is incomprehensible. It is much slower, but dialogues, readings, and other means of communication in the classroom can provide infinite opportunities for discovery, questioning, and discussion. Also, of course, old-timers can cue in the new students.

The matter of leases cannot wait for the classroom, obviously; the students have usually hurdled or been hung up on that reality before classes begin. Frequently, the students have had no experience at home with leases, let alone any understanding of the language in which leases are couched in English. A translation may be the answer for those with quite low-level proficiency, or an experienced friend who can explain the contract may meet the need. It is essential, however, that the students know the conditions that govern their housing and meal service, if provided. However this is accomplished, it must be accomplished from the outset.

Guidance and aid in many of those areas can be handled by the adviser as suggested in Bens' article, "Advising and the Intensive Course" or through a modification of that method.

Health Service and Insurance

It is amazing how quickly some students need a doctor after their arrival. Whether there is student health service available on the campus or whether a local doctor or doctors are expected to supply medical attention, the students need to know what to do when they are sick. If a doctor or nurse is available who speaks the student's language, many difficulties are avoided. If this is not possible, the language program should have a record of those from the student body or staff who can provide translating and interpreting services for both doctors and students who cannot wait until the class has a lesson on health terms—so that the symptoms, diagnoses, and prescriptions can be mutually understood.

Still, the students will be greatly appreciative if they are exposed early to some of the basic vocabulary and structures they need in order to communicate in the area of health.

Provision should be made by the program for the students to have health insurance. Many may already have insurance; however, it is essential that the students have adequate coverage and the program has an obligation to see that they do. Several companies handle insurance for international students.

Right to Privacy

On campuses where there is much political activity, research endeavor, international exchange, or other activity that would cause persons to contact the intensive English program for names and addresses of international students, it is important to protect their rights of privacy. One program has prepared a "statement of release" that allows the students at the time of registration to indicate whether they authorize their names and addresses to be released to groups such as these: nationality clubs on campus; Americans going abroad; students or faculty doing research who request help from those with specific language, cultural, or ethnic backgrounds; visitors from the students' countries; institutions requesting information on their language proficiency and performance in the program; and other persons whom the student might specify. The students respond affirmatively or negatively to each of these categories and then sign and date their statements. Because this is done when the students register, often within hours of their arrival, the form is presented in the five most commonly represented languages. It has proved to be an extremely valuable record.

On-Campus Opportunities for Learning

The imagination of the staff and the resources of the campus are the only limiting factors in providing intensive English students with the opportunity to become part of the institution community. While there may be some campus organizations or privileges closed to them because of their status, there are always avenues open for learning about both academic and nonacademic activities. These can be language-related activities that extend from playing BINGO in the student union (ever-popular because, once the numbers and letters can be heard, even the student with the lowest language proficiency can participate as a peer with the native speakers) to attending a drama together after the play has been studied in class by upper-level students. Or they can be nonlanguage activities such as sports, concerts, or tours of campus facilities.

The program needs to be alert to opportunities that will help students grow in language competency and in understanding of the world around them. A preliminary introduction to the institution or locality should be supplied. This can be done through program-wide orien-

tation sessions, classroom instructional materials designed to introduce the subject, or through the organization of interest groups.

Community Programming

Within any community there are segments that want to learn about, meet with, and make welcome the international visitor. There are two unique problems that the intensive English program will meet in making such encounters possible: the language limitations of the students and possibly their temporary stay in the community.

Because many of the students have serious problems with communication during their first weeks or even months in the United States, there can be a reluctance on the part of the community and/or on the part of the student to entertain or be entertained in homes. One solution to this potential difficulty is to make group encounters possible—multiple student groups (with those having some skill with the language giving support to those without) and multiple community representative groups (for example, two families, or service or church organizations working jointly). The obvious difficulty comes when the two "multiple" groups polarize in conversation among themselves, but if this happens the mix or the motives need to be reexamined.

For the person in charge of making host family/student matches, probably the task which is most difficult and which defies exact definition and routine procedure is that of providing, to the extent humanly possible, combinations that have a reasonable chance of success, combinations that are compatible religiously, ethnically, and politically, as well as being devoid of vested interests that go beyond wanting to learn and share together.

It should be kept in mind that students have much to share as well as much to learn. When they have the language skill needed, they can enjoy the thrill of meeting with school children and also the challenge of presenting their views, their heritage, and their objectives to adults. Even before they have this language proficiency, however, group sharing of music can provide communication that surmounts language barriers.

Inherent within language programs is the large turnover of students each term and, in many programs, the departure of students to academic studies in other institutions. These factors affect both campus and community programming. The program needs to be aware that however pleased a person, department, unit, or organization may be to welcome and help international students become acquainted with the campus or the community, a repetition of the request for cooperation every semester, term, eight weeks, or whatever the length of the session in the language program may be, can become a burden, not a pleasure. A variety of programming ideas that can be rotated, changed, and renewed is necessary.

In the area of host families, the transient nature of the students can be a problem or an advantage. Some host families would rather have a student who will remain in the community for several years and with whom they can become well acquainted. On the other hand, there are those who would like to be host families but cannot or do not wish to commit themselves to a long period of time. The latter group may be the nucleus for host families for students on the move.

Remember that the international student will need to know where and how to catch a bus, where the commodities they want to buy are available, how U.S. banks operate, and all of those everyday concerns that will help them feel at home in the community that would welcome them with meals and meetings. Programming that will provide this orientation along with an opportunity to become a part of the community will create a comfortable atmosphere for the language student.

Student Management

Shigeo Imamura

Preface

TESL personnel recognize that foreign students in intensive programs are mature adults capable of making their own decisions and therefore in little need of "management." At the same time, incidents of behavior which appear to indicate immaturity can be observed—failure to enroll in required ESL classes, absenteeism, tardiness, speaking out of turn in class, and failure to do homework. Since the goal is to be able to treat students as adults, guidelines are needed for dealing with these kinds of problems. What follows is a discussion of some suggestions for adult student management.

Failure to Enroll

Problems with ESL students can begin when they do not enroll for the ESL courses which they were recommended for or are required to take. Through experience, often bitter, some institutions have devised ingenious policies and practices which prevent foreign students from enrolling in any *academic* course unless they have registered for the recommended ESL classes. Some accomplish this with the "hold card" system, while others prevent entry into the registration area until after the registration card has been filled out with the recommended ESL classes. At any rate, if an institution has a policy of requiring ESL courses, either full time or part time, on the basis of ESL screening/placement tests, then there must be a definite and binding means of enforcement. Without it, those students with false confidence in their English skills will seek to bypass the ESL courses. If successful in doing so, some are likely to face academic failure or at least the complaints of faculty members who perceive their inadequate English ability.

In order for the institution to justifiably require foreign students to enroll in ESL courses and hold them to it, the standard of English language proficiency deemed necessary for full-time academic work must be set at a reasonable level. Experience suggests that no one standard can be set for all institutions. Each institution must decide for itself the "passing" score for different academic levels and different academic disciplines. However, the essential point in terms of student management is that there exists a *practical* means of enforcement of ESL requirements, as past experience at various institutions shows that total reliance on student conscience just does not work.

Absenteeism

Several institutions have attempted to find a meaningful correlation between class attendance and the rate of language learning. None has been found so far. However, anyone in this business knows how harmful absenteeism can be to class morale and how much time is wasted on the part of the absentee, the teacher, and the rest of the class. In order to keep absenteeism to a minimum, there must be rules—rules made perfectly clear to all students at the beginning of the program term.

One practice commonly found among ESL programs is that of holding students responsible for a certain percentage of attendance. The figure most frequently used seems to be 90 percent. What differs most from one institution to another is the fate of students who accumulate more absences than they are allowed. Some institutions dismiss the absentees on a class-to-class basis when they go over the limit for each class. However, since students tend to accumulate most of their absences toward the end of the term, many institutions simply ignore the fact and take no action. Others do not allow the student to sit for the final examination. Still others go strictly by the book and dismiss the student when the absence limit is reached.

If an ESL program has attendance rules, they are in place for maintaining the integrity of the program and maximizing the learning opportunities of the students. The same thing that was said above about nonenrollment can be said here—if an institution is to have policies, they must be accompanied by rules and means of enforcement. If students can have more absences than allowed without being reprimanded, the rules of attendance might as well be eliminated.

One word of caution: administrators are here to *serve* students, not to punish them. The consequences of absenteeism must be handled in a business-like fashion, without emotion. If the rules require that a student be dismissed because of excessive absences, the administration should do everything possible to help the student gain admission to another program so that he or she will not be out of status as far

as the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) is concerned. However, in a case where it is obvious that the student does not have either the capability or the intention of seriously pursuing further English study, all reasonable measures should be taken to see that the student returns home.

Tardiness

Perhaps because of differences in attitude or custom, some students seem to have difficulty understanding why punctuality in class attendance is required. Some ESL program administrators have the feeling that if students come late to class and miss out on some opportunities to learn, it is their own business. However, all classroom teachers know how irritating it is for students to straggle in, disrupting the flow of class and wasting everyone else's time by asking questions about the portions of the presentation they missed.

If a program is to have rules on attendance, then it should have rules on tardiness, also. One common practice is to count two or three lates as equal to one absence. While it is difficult to determine exactly how late "late" is, usually this decision is left up to the individual teacher. It would seem unreasonable to mark students late when they arrive just two or three minutes late and show obvious signs that they had tried hard to get to class on time. On the other hand, occasionally students stroll into class half an hour or more late. Anything more than fifteen to twenty minutes late should be marked as an absence rather than a "late."

General Rules of Conduct

Except for highly gifted individuals, second language learning by those after puberty tends to require high concentration and continual effort. Especially in intensive English programs, a continuous effort is needed to achieve the expected goals in a limited number of weeks or months. Any element in the student's environment that would interfere with this effort should be removed, if possible.

Most students come from educational systems far more conservative and rigid than the U.S. system. Upon entering this system, some tend to become confused, unable to distinguish between personal and academic freedom on the one hand and license on the other. Perhaps this is because they have difficulty in recognizing the norms of acceptable behavior in a strange cultural setting; students from certain cultures show consistent patterns of unwelcome behavior that often interfere with not only their own learning process but that of other students as well. Therefore, it seems necessary to establish guidelines for class conduct to help students follow an acceptable norm of behavior. Of course, what specific behavior is considered

acceptable or unacceptable may differ from program to program, depending on the attitude of particular administrators and teachers and on the types of students accommodated by the program.

Generally speaking, excessive or unreasonable class interruptions by students should not be allowed. This includes asking questions or stating opinions while the teacher is talking, speaking out when another student is being asked to respond, speaking out loud to another student or students during class, constantly asking classmates from the same language background for definitions in the native language, and so on. It should be made clear to all students at the beginning of the term that such behavior is unacceptable in the American ESL classroom.

Experience shows that teachers who try to be "buddies" with their students tend to unwittingly invite these unacceptable forms of behavior. It is wise for teachers to start the term in a business-like manner and stand firm against such behavior from the very beginning—it is much easier to relax the rules later on than it is to belatedly put new rules into effect. The "firm but friendly" beginning is especially recommended for young female teachers, who are apt to be plagued by misconduct from those students unused to being under the control of women in the classroom.

In the unfortunate circumstance that a teacher is required to reprimand a student for unacceptable classroom behavior, a basic pedagogical rule of not scolding a student in public should be kept in mind. Giving warnings and reminders in the classroom is all right, but any real reprimand should be done in private, in one's office or in the classroom after the others have gone.

Lastly, the students at the other extreme—those who are reluctant to speak up in class—must not be forgotten. While no *rules* can be established to counteract this tendency, the teacher should constantly encourage the timid to speak out and the vociferous to restrain themselves. In short, the main objective of student management concerning class behavior is to ensure that each and every student in class has an equal opportunity to learn, without interference or domination by others in the class.

Homework

Without careful management by the administration, ESL students can easily be overloaded or "underloaded" with homework. However, assuming that this problem does not exist, what student management is needed in the assignment of homework? The problem is that there are some students who either consistently or sporadically do not do their homework. Should there be some form of reprimand for this? Here again, it can be said that the only losers are the students them-

selves. However, there usually tends to be a good correlation between the amount of homework accomplished and the rate of progress in language learning. Students who miss doing a lot of homework often lag behind in class—but this is not always the case. The whole purpose of assigning homework is to encourage students to use their out-of-class time for study and review of the target language rather than engaging in nonproductive activity. Yet, we know some students who make excellent use of their out-of-class time, associating with their American friends and thereby learning a lot of English. Their aural comprehension, their verbal fluency, their English vocabulary all improve. If the students appear to be using the target language effectively outside of class, then there is no real need to insist that they do their homework. For those who neglect their homework and do *not* show progress in the use of the target language, the teacher should insist on their doing their homework, going so far as to dismiss the students from class if they continue to ignore their assignments. However, this is a rather delicate matter and should be dealt with case-by-case by the individual teacher.

Conclusion

For most students, there is hardly any need for student management. Most of them are sincere, hard-working individuals. On the other hand, there are those who occasionally need discipline for one reason or another. Where discipline is due, it must be applied. However, this should be done for the sole purpose of maintaining the integrity of the program, in a routine fashion. The purpose is *not* to punish the individuals involved but to provide the best learning environment possible for the many, without interference by the few.

Faculty

Faculty

David E. Eskey

Introduction

The single most important feature of any program in English as a second language is the teaching faculty. Despite the real importance of sound program design, effective methods and materials, and strong administrative support, when all is said and done, good teachers make good programs and bad teachers make bad ones. The students, once enrolled, are largely a given, and programs that now boast "focus on the learner" should add that it is the teacher who must do the focusing. The tendency to think of programs in terms of course descriptions, particular methods, or the great reputations of affiliated scholars distracts our attention from the crucial question: How good are the teachers? The answer to that question will always provide the best measure of program quality, and the ultimate success of any language teaching program will largely be determined by the day-to-day performance of its faculty. Particular attention must therefore be devoted to the staffing, supervision, and in-service teacher training of these all-important people.

Staffing

A major problem world-wide in the field of language teaching is the popular belief that anyone who can speak a language can teach it. The fact is, however, that language teaching requires a special combination of knowledge and skills that is always hard to find, and finding teachers who have it should be the first concern of any good administration. The problem is further aggravated by the fact that some untrained teachers (or teachers trained in a different specialization) turn out to be relatively good in the classroom, and some who appear to have excellent credentials turn out to be mediocre or worse. It is,

however, comforting to note that there are candidates for teaching positions who are, simultaneously, well trained in the field, experienced in relevant and challenging settings, and effective in the classroom. And it is this kind of teacher that ought to be recruited for intensive English programs. Thus, the minimal requirements for full- or part-time teaching in a quality program might be (1) a master's degree in teaching English as a second language or applied linguistics from a reputable college or university, and (2) one to three years' experience teaching in a recognized second or foreign language program, that is, a program employing at least one specialist in the field who would be willing to provide a recommendation for the candidate based on professional criteria, including actual observation of teaching. Beyond this, administrators should look for teachers who have demonstrated (1) an ability to work well with people of other cultures (having lived and/or taught overseas for a year or more may provide some evidence of this); (2) an ability to work well with professional colleagues (frequently noted in recommendations); and (3) a degree of flexibility—an openness to innovation and the capability to adjust to the needs of a changing situation (often hard to gauge in advance, but beware of candidates who place strict limitations on the subjects and levels they are interested in). For teaching assistants pursuing the M.A., the degree requirement must of course be waived, but even in awarding positions to this group, preference should be given to candidates with relevant teaching experience. Former Peace Corps volunteers, for example, often make excellent teachers-in-training.

A second major problem is the program taught by professionals (often young ones), but administered by amateurs considered by those in authority to be, in some unspecified way, "good administrators." This arrangement is nearly always a mistake. At least the director of a language teaching program—and, preferably, any other major administrators—should be a recognized specialist in the field. Just as a good choreographer must also be a dancer, so a director of this kind of program must be, or have been, both a teacher and a student of language teaching and learning. Any other arrangement raises serious doubts about the professional status of the program.

In recruiting qualified personnel, administrators should look to the better teacher-training programs (Blatchford's *Directory of Teacher Preparation Programs* provides a useful survey).[1] Moreover, they should advertise in the periodicals most widely read among professionals. Obvious examples include the *NAFSA Newsletter*, the *TESOL Quarterly*, the regional newsletters of NAFSA and TESOL affiliates, and the

1. Charles Blatchford, *Directory of Teacher Preparation Programs in TESOL and Bilingual Education, 1978–81*, 5th edition (Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1979), 206 pp.

Linguistic Reporter published by the Center for Applied Linguistics (3520 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007). In securing meaningful recommendations, personal contacts are of course very useful—still another argument in favor of the active, well-established professional director.

The kinds of contracts offered by particular programs will vary considerably as to whether teaching assistants are employed and whether the program is seasonal or year-round, but one problem is especially worthy of note. Historically, far too many programs have depended, largely or wholly, on part-time teaching—a situation detrimental to the teachers themselves and to the professional reputation of the field. The teacher who is paid by the teaching hour is unlikely to invest a great deal of time in the planning, research, and program evaluation that make for a truly professional effort. In this situation, what should be a center of scholarly endeavor turns into a business, frequently a very lucrative business, but not the kind of operation scholars can respect. The reason for the part-time syndrome is clear—part-time teachers cost less because they can be paid for just the hours they teach, hired and fired at will, and denied the kinds of fringe benefits that normally go with a full-time position. (Furthermore, the problems of tenure and faculty status can often be avoided by employing part-timers.) But the cost in program quality is high. Too many language-teaching programs are sheepherding operations staffed by underpaid teachers rushing from one part-time job to another. Under these circumstances, teachers naturally lean toward stale formulas and clever ways of cutting corners in lieu of undertaking the really difficult task of developing courses adjusted to the special needs of particular students in a particular setting. Administrators should therefore attempt to establish as many full-time positions as possible, and do whatever can be done to reduce the ratio of part- to full-time teaching in intensive English programs. More full-time contracts at competitive salaries (including the usual fringe benefits) would go a long way toward improving both the quality of programs and the academic image of second language teaching. Teaching assistants present a special kind of problem in that graduate students who are also trying to teach are almost by definition overworked. But if carefully chosen for their interest in the field, they are likely to develop a real commitment to their teaching and a serious concern for curricula, methods, and materials—the kind of concern that can lead to better programs.

Teacher Supervision

Supervision of good teachers is a tight-rope act. On the one hand, there is obviously a need for establishing some kind of program structure. Both students and faculty need to know what the ground rules

are—the testing procedures, criteria for placement and for promotion or failure, and attendance regulations. Students especially need the assurance that different sections of the same course will not differ radically in content and form. On the other hand, there is a complementary need for flexibility. Teachers differ in their strengths and weaknesses and in their teaching styles, and even the best-structured program should allow for these differences, for creative innovation, and for adjusting to the needs of particular classes and particular students. Students differ in their needs and capacities too, and every teacher must learn to read and to respond to these differences as a first step toward becoming consistently effective. In this connection, nothing is less likely to succeed than the rigid syllabus, with detailed day-to-day instructions from which the teacher may not deviate. The unfortunate belief that language courses and materials can be made "teacher-proof" is related to the notion, mentioned above, that anyone who can speak a language can teach it. This kind of thinking may help to sell commercially packaged programs and materials, but no administrator should take it seriously. To paraphrase Aristotle, there is no royal road to second-language teaching, either.

Supervision is something of a loaded term, with its overtones of bosses ordering simple-minded workers around, but at its best in this field supervision takes the form of a gathering of colleagues, administrators and instructors, committed to the common cause of making the most of a particular program. It is of course true that administrators have more responsibility for (and more authority in) making policy, but it is primarily the teachers who transform policy into the day-to-day life of the program. Effective supervision should therefore always be based on direct observation of the teacher in the classroom, and, by the same token, such observations should always lead directly to teacher/supervisor conferences. Supervisors must find the time to observe classes and to discuss their observations with each of the teachers who create the real program in their classes. There must also, of course, be the usual general faculty meetings and meetings of particular groups of faculty (for example, those teaching a common subject or class), but no amount of discussion, however well-informed, that does not include discussion based on direct observation of teaching can satisfy the need for adequate supervision of teachers.

In programs employing teaching assistants, supervision acquires a special urgency. Teaching assistants, as teachers-in-training, have a right to systematic professional help, and students have a complementary right to know that their instructors, if relatively untrained, are working under frequent and careful supervision. It should not, however, simply be assumed that every TA will be inexperienced. Some candidates for graduate degrees may already have taught extensively elsewhere and may in fact be among the better teachers in the pro-

gram. In recruiting TAs, administrators should actively pursue this kind of candidate. Beginners must, of course, be accommodated too—every new teacher needs a chance to start somewhere. But each program should place some limit on the number of completely inexperienced instructors employed and should provide each of these (in addition to the usual kinds of supervision) with an experienced colleague to serve as a kind of big brother or sister in supplying individual assistance as needed.

No matter what the level of the teachers, however, supervisors must learn to observe and listen with open minds. Each situation is unique, and there are many kinds of good teaching, many possible responses to a given situation which might facilitate learning. Supervising good teachers is much more like coaching talented athletes than like overseeing a work crew. Supervisors should therefore approach teachers cautiously, not as experts with ready-made solutions to their problems, but as experienced colleagues prepared to consider each problem that arises in class, and (except in cases of total disaster) to offer suggestions, not to issue directives. The good supervisor must, above all, be readily available to the teachers, deal with even the weakest of the group as a colleague, and do his or her best to establish the right kind of atmosphere to work in—supportive, stimulating, and noncompetitive—within which every teacher in the program might realize his or her full potential.

In-Service Teacher Training

The trouble with teacher training, as that phrase is commonly understood, is that it cannot be done. There is no magic formula for turning anyone who wants to become one into an effective classroom teacher. Teaching is an art, and teacher-training programs should therefore be devoted to (1) identifying good, or potentially good, teachers, (2) helping good teachers to become even better, and (3) getting rid of bad teachers as quickly and painlessly as possible. It should also be noted that the second-language classroom calls for a special kind of teacher, one who is especially good at interacting personally with students. The kind of teacher who prefers to remain aloof from students, whose main qualification is superior knowledge of some esoteric corner of academia, has no place in ESL, which is largely a matter of quasinatural—albeit carefully staged—interpersonal exchange among teachers, as facilitators of learning, and the learners themselves. Identifying teachers who are good at this (and, conversely, those who have no talent for it) should be the primary function of any teacher training program in this field.

As the three objectives cited above suggest, the line between teacher supervision and training is a hazy one. The ideal situation is a closely related teacher training program which leads to a degree or other

certification and an ESL program which provides opportunities for classroom teaching. The former can offer the proper academic background—in the nature of language, in the structure of English, in theories of language acquisition—while the latter can offer supervised practical experience which any language teacher needs and deserves.

Even in the absence of this arrangement, however, some teacher training may be built into the program—assuming that the program employs, or has access to, senior faculty qualified to provide it—as part of the normal supervisory process. At the very least, every faculty member, from TAs to the most experienced full-timer, should be encouraged (and, whenever possible, supported for conferences and workshops) to become members of, and to take an active part in, major professional organizations—especially the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and their regional and local affiliates. There is always something new to learn in the field and good teachers never complete their teacher training. Program administrators must make every effort to promote the professional development of each faculty member by offering guidance, advice, and support, by rewarding professional accomplishment (presentations, publications) and by insisting on a minimal level of professionalism. The teacher who is no longer interested in learning is, generally, no longer interested in teaching, either.

A Final Note on Teaching

Despite the relatively low estate which teachers seem to have fallen into lately, teaching arguably remains the quintessential human activity. Since culture is learned, not inherited, every culture's first concern must be perpetuating itself. In this respect, teaching, the passing on of culture to each new generation of students, has a special importance and merits greater respect than most people now feel for a profession regarded as a home for "those who can't" as opposed to "those who can" and do. The trouble with the can/can't argument, however, is that those who can soon become those who could. George Bernard Shaw, who penned the original aphorism, has been dead for some time, and it is mainly thanks to teachers that a few cultured people still read his plays—and thanks to language teachers in particular that there are so many people in so many places who can understand the language that he wrote them in. Administrators of intensive English programs simply cannot afford the luxury of patronizing good teachers, whatever their position in the current professional pecking order. Indeed the administrators' primary function will always be recruiting, maintaining, and developing a first-rate teaching faculty.

Program

Curriculum Design and the Selection of Teaching Materials

Barry P. Taylor

The design of a curriculum and the selection of appropriate teaching materials for that curriculum can, in a very real sense, be considered to be the heart of an intensive English program, in that they represent both the form and the content of the language instruction. As such, these two important aspects of curriculum planning require and deserve careful consideration, for not only are they of crucial pedagogical importance, but they also interrelate in a number of significant ways, both with each other and with the organizational structure of the program as a whole. No decision about curriculum or materials is ever straightforward, since all component parts of a program interact in mutually interdependent ways. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to describe briefly some of these interrelated issues which must be considered in designing a viable curriculum for an intensive English program and then selecting appropriate teaching materials for it.

Curriculum designers, when faced with the task of determining the form and content of their intensive ESL classes, need to keep in mind two distinct areas of concern as they begin planning:

1. The structural/logistical/administrative aspects of the program
2. The philosophical/theoretical/pedagogical aspects of the program

Structural/Logistical/Administrative Aspects of the Program

Enrollment

The enrollment in an intensive English program, that is, the number of students attending classes at any given time, is the first important variable to consider in curriculum design because it directly triggers a chain of curricular and organizational decisions. Most important,

the enrollment determines the maximum number of distinct proficiency levels which can be used to form the basis of the curriculum and into which students can be divided. For example, assuming that a range of 10 to 15 students is a budgetary and pedagogically reasonable class size, a program with fifty students would be limited to offering classes at no more than three (possibly four) distinct proficiency levels. Depending upon the reliability of maintaining a stable enrollment session after session, an administrator might choose the lower number of levels to work with on a long-term, curricular-planning basis. If there is a possibility that future sessions might have fewer students, a redesign of the curriculum into a smaller number of levels would then be necessary.

It is to the advantage of both the teacher and the students that levels maintain continuity and that classes be as homogeneous in proficiency as possible, so at least three different class levels (low, intermediate, advanced) are usually considered minimal. Programs with higher enrollments may choose to divide students more finely by establishing up to six or seven levels; curriculum planners should be aware, however, that as the number of levels grows, it becomes increasingly difficult to find suitably distinct sets of teaching materials that are compatible with the pedagogical/philosophical/theoretical orientation of the program. Distinct sets of materials that do not overlap are necessary in programs in which students move sequentially through a series of levels to avoid having the students repeat the same materials in more advanced levels in the sequence. Alternatively, larger enrollments can be accommodated in programs with a smaller number of levels by offering multiple sections of fewer levels, each one "fine tuned" to the exact level of the class.

Directly related to the number of levels in a program and, in fact, dependent on it, is the duration of each session. In a program that advances students sequentially from a beginning level through an advanced level, it can be assumed that it takes approximately one calendar year for those students to acquire adequate proficiency for academic study in English. The sessions, therefore, need to be the length required for students to progress from the lowest to the highest levels within one year.

An increasing number of programs have experimented with session lengths that are shorter than a semester—most ranging from four to seven or eight weeks. Experience indicates that there appear to be both advantages and disadvantages to almost any session length selected. Some of the advantages cited are the following:

1. Longer sessions allow the teacher and the students to develop greater rapport.
2. Shorter sessions allow programs to advance faster learners more rapidly by building in more frequent regroupings (e.g., once every

four weeks versus once every four months), and they relieve the mid-semester "slump" common in longer sessions.

3. Shorter sessions allow programs to accommodate the admission and placement of students more frequently and less disruptively throughout the year, not only at major semester breaks.

On the other hand, the following disadvantages have been noted:

1. Shorter sessions create less teacher-student rapport, but this problem can be partially alleviated by increasing the number of daily hours an instructor spends with a given group of students.
2. Shorter sessions are administratively taxing, especially for programs with large enrollments.
3. Shorter sessions make textbook selection difficult, since many ESL texts are written for semester-length courses. When longer texts are used in shorter sessions, students often become frustrated if they use only part of the text chosen for their class. While it is certainly possible to divide a text between two contiguous levels in a sequence, problems arise if, at the start of a new session, students are regrouped so that some have worked through the first part of the text but others have not. This problem can be minimized, although not entirely solved, by building a short review of the first part of the text into the course designed to work through the second part. In this way, all students in the class have a more common basis of experience from which to progress.

Instructional Staff

The composition and status of the teaching staff are also important factors to consider in curriculum planning. Whether the instructors are full time or part time, and whether they are already trained or are still in training are concerns which affect academic decisions. If a sizeable percentage of the staff is composed of part-time graduate teaching assistants, for example, their supervisor will probably want them to get a wide range of teaching experiences at the various levels and in the various skill areas included in the program. In that case, it would probably be advisable to develop a curriculum that is rather detailed and specific to provide a teacher inexperienced in a particular skill at a particular level with some concrete guidelines and specifications to work from. If a large number of the teachers are full time and experienced, other options are available to the curriculum planner, such as flexible or experimental course syllabi which can capitalize on individual teachers' areas of specialization, or self-contained, fully integrated classes—alternatives not possible when the staff is composed of relatively inexperienced teachers, each teaching one or two hours per day. In any event, a curriculum planner is strongly advised to bear in mind the importance of establishing and maintain-

ing continuity within the course work at the various proficiency levels for the students who are progressing sequentially through the program. Without careful coordination and complementing of each skill area at each level, classroom instruction, no matter how effective, runs the risk of being unfocused within the overall curriculum of the program as a whole.

Students

Curriculum planning cannot be seriously undertaken without considering the students—their background, their reasons for studying English, and their particular language needs. The selection of materials and the activities chosen to be included in the program must address such needs, be they English for scientific, academic, or social purposes. Curriculum planners should be wary, however, of inappropriately over-emphasizing one or more of these approaches, since most domestic ESL students, regardless of their *primary* reason for studying English, need to learn to function in a full range of social, academic, and professional settings.

Facilities and Resources

The physical resources available to an intensive English program can also play a significant role in curriculum design and the selection of teaching materials. For example, the availability of a language laboratory, of audiovisual taping and playback equipment, and of other electronic teaching aids can provide students with additional language practice outside the classroom and can thereby save class time for other activities. A resource library for teachers and facilities for the duplication of supplementary, teacher-written instructional materials can minimize the need for the chosen text(s) to "do it all." The extent to which community resources outside the program can be integrated into classroom instruction can affect the kinds of activities which are undertaken in the classroom and can create real language experiences in ways that classroom simulations cannot. The more that can be accomplished outside of class in terms of practice and experience, the more class time is available for real instruction.

Philosophical/Theoretical/Pedagogical Aspects of the Program

Knowing the number of levels a program has, the length of the sessions, the available resources and facilities, and the general status of the instructors and the students still does not determine what will actually be taught in the program. In fact, beyond knowing that the materials will be graded and sequenced from level to level, what those materials are and how their actual sequencing is accomplished cannot be determined until the logistical concerns discussed above are com-

bined with the theoretical orientation of the individual responsible for designing the curriculum and establishing the focus of the program. That person will have to make a number of decisions based on those considerations, but before that work proceeds, the course planner needs to establish the general content of the curriculum itself. That is, what form should the curriculum take? Should it be an explicit list of graded and sequenced student learning objectives, or should the curriculum be a list of texts and appropriate accompanying activities?

Despite the relative ease with which a textbook list can be established as compared with specifying student learning objectives, it seems, nevertheless, to be intuitively more satisfying to base a curriculum on established goals and objectives—that is, before specifying the texts and activities, to decide what it is that the students need to learn. Goals and objectives are crucial because they provide a yardstick against which to measure teaching practices. Such goals are not determined or defined by the texts or the materials which are used; quite the contrary, texts and materials become useful only to the extent that they provide vehicles for the attainment of those goals. With clearly established goals and objectives in mind, then, the value of an approach or technique or gimmick as a learning and teaching device can be determined. Basing a curriculum on goals and objectives makes it possible to address more effectively specific learner needs than can be accomplished by solely relying on the lessons in a text.

Identifying and specifying realistic goals and objectives requires both a clear understanding of what the students need to learn and a recognition of the importance of individualization; that is, that different students have different needs, and that specific goals and objectives will have to address those differences.

One critical goal that can be specified from the outset, and can be central to general curriculum planning, is that students must become self-reliant in their language use. It is important that they acquire open-ended, productive language skills which will allow them to monitor their own language performance without depending on a teacher. One major problem in accomplishing that objective, however, is that it is often difficult to determine the best way to accomplish it. Making a clear distinction in the curriculum between *intensive* work and *extensive* work, a distinction which closely parallels the in-class and out-of-class dichotomy, may help.

When in-class activities are *intensive* and oriented toward the acquisition of *skills*, students are able to apply those skills *extensively* outside of class, in the form of practice. Open-ended, productive reading skills and selective listening skills, for example, could be taught in class but practiced extensively outside of class. In fact, for most of the productive and receptive language skills, a clearly delineated intensive/extensive dichotomy could be devised to make maxi-

mally effective use of the pedagogical techniques and activities currently available.

With the focus of the curriculum clearly established, the curriculum designer can turn to questions concerning the details of the curriculum—questions such as the following:

1. How should a 4–5 hour instructional day be divided? One hour for each skill area with a different instructor for each? Or, in two-hour, two-skill blocks with one teacher each? Or, perhaps not divided at all, in a fully integrated four-hour day with one instructor? (It should be noted that for the last alternative, well-trained, full-time instructors would be required. Furthermore, fully integrated programs would effectively exclude the enrollment of students who could only attend on a part-time daily basis.)
   - If the skill areas are to be combined, should they be grouped together in the same way at all levels? Should the focus at the lower levels be different from that at the higher levels?
   - If skill areas are combined in two-hour blocks, is there a good text appropriate for that level which combines the teaching of those skills? Is it possible to combine two skills into one class if there is no suitable text?
2. How should the instruction (and, therefore, the materials) be sequenced through the levels? By grammatical complexity? By level of vocabulary? Along a notional/functional analysis? Along some other lines?
3. What kinds of materials should be selected?
   - Those that present material in the traditional, syntactically sequenced manner?
   - Those that are based on communicative or functional approach?
   - Those that are task-oriented, learner-centered, or otherwise shift the focus from the language as an object of explicit study and instead regard language as a tool?
   - Those that require extensive teacher involvement?
   - Perhaps no explicit text at all? Perhaps a Community Language Learning or Silent Way approach which would allow for the creation of materials as they were needed?

The questions that a curriculum planner must answer are numerous. At every step along the way, issues are raised, problems need to be solved. And, even after most of the questions have been answered, the kinds of materials desired might not be available. In most cases, curriculum planners learn to settle for existing materials and adapt them. Nonetheless, approaches, attitudes, theories, and techniques are always changing. Thus, even after the curriculum planner's work is done, it is important to be flexible and adaptable and to recognize that a curriculum that looks good today might need revision tomorrow. And so it is in any dynamic field.

Student Development in the Intensive English Program

Richard L. Daesch

The primary purpose of the intensive English program on college and university campuses in the United States is to prepare foreign students for entrance to colleges and universities. The effort is to teach the English language and to provide the student with an exposure to American culture, customs, and university life prior to enrollment in an academic program. Though the teaching of ESL/EFL is the major focus of the intensive English program, classes designed to develop the student's awareness of the new environment can be made a part of the curriculum.

At present, "non-academic" offerings of intensive English programs normally consist of orientation sessions conducted over a period of one or two days by a foreign student adviser at the beginning of each school term. Orientation continues throughout the school term on a one-on-one consulting basis—adviser and student. Consultations with the adviser must be arranged according to openings in the student's schedule of classes, which is sometimes difficult to manage without the loss of class time.

Initial orientation programs consist largely of explanations of the services provided by the intensive English program, opportunities and services provided by the university and the community, and academic policies and requirements of the intensive English program. Topics generally included in initial orientation programs are:

1. Housing in apartments and residence halls
2. Immigration regulations
3. Health services
4. Extracurricular activities such as university clubs and sports
5. Student conduct
6. Library services

7. Student activities and recreation
8. Geography of the community
9. Intensive English program requirements
   a. Programs
   b. Grades
   c. Attendance
   d. Language proficiency testing
   e. Evaluations of English
   f. Transcripts of English proficiency and certificates of attendance
   g. Placement in universities or colleges
10. Homestay arrangements

Orientation programs are normally extracurricular, informational in character, and usually not assessed as a part of the student's overall development. Through such programs, an attempt is made to acculturate the foreign students by procuring living accommodations which bring them into contact with Americans, by encouraging them to engage in as many extracurricular activities as possible (such as university clubs and sports which provide opportunities to meet Americans), and by exposing them to American family life through stays with American families which may involve dinner, overnight or weekend visits, and, in some cases, visits as long as a week or more.

Unfortunately, there are two impediments to learning about the culture in the way just described. First, because of the language problem, situations like those mentioned may be embarrassing and nonproductive for the intensive English student because of his inability to communicate. American roommates in the undergraduate dormitories are often reluctant to spend their time with someone they cannot communicate with. Also, feelings of insecurity with the language on the part of the foreign student may make him reluctant to join in extracurricular activities with Americans. Further, home visits are often uncomfortable and nonproductive when hosts cannot understand their guests and vice versa. Second, the intensive nature of the curriculum of the intensive English program does not allow the student adequate time to engage in extracurricular activities. The intensive language student is in class twenty-five to thirty hours per week, which leaves very little time to complete the assigned homework, much less to join a club or participate in an organized sports activity. The fact is, little time and energy is left for the student to develop in other essential ways not directly concerned with language classes.

What is needed is a program model for student development incorporated into the academic structure of the intensive English program and designed to assist the student in making a thorough adjustment to the new culture. Classes can be offered in a formal systematic way

in order to develop the student's readiness for college study in the American classroom. Students need to know more about American culture, mores, customs, social and political institutions, student relationships with professors and other students, and university policies and procedures. In short, the structure of an intensive English program should include classes on a par with the regular curriculum, consisting of activities intended to acculturate the student.

In order to institute a student development program closely connected to the curriculum of the intensive English program, at least two conditions should be met. The first concerns the position of student adviser. The adviser must not be thought of simply as an information giver, a shoulder to cry on, and a social events planner. The adviser has the larger responsibility to help plan the student's education as it pertains to learning about a new culture. This part of the student's education should not be added on to the regular curriculum; rather, classes on culture and an on-going orientation effort should comprise the student development part of the overall program. Consequently, the title of "student development coordinator" would seem more suitable than "student adviser," in the opinion of this writer.

The second condition involves instructional scheduling. In order to allow time in the curriculum for a student development program, the number of hours reserved for intensive English instruction per se should be reduced. The average number of hours offered per week in intensive English programs in the U.S. is about twenty-three, and many programs offer as many as thirty hours per week. This large amount of time for English classes is not necessary or required. The Consortium on Intensive English Programs (CIEP) in the United States defines "intensive" as a minimum of twenty hours of instruction per week of which fifteen must be in-class activities (the other five hours could be reserved for the language laboratory). Therefore, if twenty hours is reasonable, and most IEPs offer more, the English program would not suffer greatly, if at all, by converting three to five hours per week of those classes offered, over and above the minimum of twenty hours per week suggested by the CIEP, to a student development program.

The development program suggested here would consist of three to five hours per week of class studies in addition to at least twenty of basic English instruction. For most intensive programs this would simply mean the conversion of time devoted to teaching English per se to the developmental program instead, obviating any additional cost considerations. Regular ESL/EFL faculty would be the primary teachers of the development classes.

The student development coordinator would have the responsibility of planning classes and activities as a member of the curriculum planning committee of the intensive English program. In this way the

language classes and development classes and activities would be integrated as parts of the total curriculum.

Development classes would include the use of outside speakers and panels from the university and community. Field trips, visits with American student groups—academic and social—would be encouraged. Planned attendance at entertainment events and extracurricular activities, with the teacher, in the university and community can and should be considered the equivalent of class meetings. In general, the program would be planned with specified goals that can be evaluated by the instructor, but the activities would be as natural as possible, devoid of the constraints imposed by the traditional classroom setting on teachers and students alike. Following is a list of topics which could be included in the program.

Apartment and dormitory living
Sororities and fraternities
Instructor-student relationships
Drinking and drugs
Male and female relationships
Types of examinations and study skills
Grading systems
Ombudsperson
Recreation and intramurals
Health services and insurance
Student activities
Student legal counsel
School vacations—things to do
Holidays
Library facilities
Student center
Student rights and responsibilities
Student government
University governance
U.S. educational system
Methods of instruction
Police and law
Payment of bills
Family relationships
Famous people
Famous places
Social order and stratification
Cities, suburbs, towns, villages
History—local and national
Political parties
Governmental organization and elections
Geography and weather
Money and banking
Economic environment
Consumerism
Postal services
Television, radio, newspapers
Music
Concepts of time
Manners and etiquette
Adjustment of spouse and children
Immigration regulations

The need to place greater emphasis on teaching intensive English students about their new environment is real. Students who cannot speak the language of their new culture too often withdraw into comfortable relationships with their own countrymen. However, these relationships, though necessary and beneficial to a young foreign student away from home for the first time, should not constitute the bulk of his or her activity outside of English class. If they do, they are coun-

terproductive to the basic goal—which is to learn the English language. A well-organized development program integrated with the English classes would provide structure and meaning to the student's experiences with the new environment, thereby encouraging greater involvement in it.

Incorporating English for Specific Purposes Programs into an On-Going Intensive Program

William E. Longenecker

This chapter presents an overview of the organizational changes the English Language Institute at Oregon State University implemented as a result of deciding to offer English for Specific Purposes programs. The focus is on recounting the perceptions and experience involved (and the steps taken) in creating a new organizational framework within the existing program structure.

The English Language Institute at Oregon State University

Created in 1965, the ELI was housed in the Division of Continuing Education. In 1975, the ELI became part of the OSU Office of International Education with all administrative functions performed through regular university procedures and offices. The ELI staff have full responsibility for determining the program curriculum, that is, for articulating learning objectives of language, culture, and study skills, and designating the materials and methodologies used to assist students to meet the objectives. Similarly, the ELI staff have responsibility for determining the scope and nature of support services provided outside the curriculum which assist students in becoming comfortable enough, in their new environment, to participate more quickly in and benefit from the curriculum. The program, then, is the combination of the curriculum and support services within an organizational framework designed to meet the perceived needs and interests of foreign students intending to enroll in regular academic programs in American colleges or universities. The organizational framework incorpo-

rates the guidelines prepared by the Consortium of Intensive English Programs (CIEP) (see "Introduction"), of which the ELI became a member in 1976. The ELI has always been financially self-sustaining.

In 1965, the ELI offered the following classes at three proficiency levels:

English Structure, Composition, and Reading Class	5 hours/week
Speech Practice and Therapy	8 hours/week
Typing for English Learning	3 hours/week
Self-Learning Center and Language Master	5 hours/week

In 1975, it offered the following classes at five proficiency levels:

English Structure	3–5 hours/week
Vocabulary and Reading	3–5 hours/week
Writing	3 hours/week
Speech	3 hours/week
Language Laboratory	5 hours/week
Study Skills Classes	2–3 hours/week

During this ten-year period, an interest in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teaching had begun to grow out of our experiences in modifying our regular program offerings to meet the needs of special groups of students. ESP, used here means the teaching methodologies and materials intended to assist nonnative speakers to learn specifically that portion of the English language they need to master to accomplish some purpose beyond actual language learning. OSU is a science-oriented institution which has always attracted students desiring highly specialized study in science and technology. Such students for whom the ELI provided ESP instruction included several groups of Taiwanese nuclear reactor operators and a group of Libyan engineers.

The reactor operators' goal was not to earn academic degrees, but to take course work designed to prepare them for a practical training period to be spent at the site of a reactor in this country. None of the Taiwanese groups was able to participate in the regular ELI program because the dates of their technical program did not coincide with the regular ELI schedule. Additionally, the project director (an engineering professor) and the participants (all of whom had studied EFL in Taiwan) did not feel their language needs could be met by the regular ELI curriculum. It was necessary, therefore, for the ELI to design a curriculum that was oriented to the special goals of that particular group of students. We began calling the goals "special" because they fell outside of the then current goals of the on-going ELI classes.

The group of Libyan engineers came to OSU on a contract program leading to a bachelor's degree. The contract provided for the ELI to

offer ESP instruction to the group concurrent with academic work in regular university classes. Once again, both the project director and participants wanted "special" instruction in the language they were going to encounter in their special academic study program. So, the decision was made not to incorporate the group into the ELI but to design a special program for them. Because this group intended to earn bachelor's degrees which included all of the usual nontechnical course work, there ultimately were some regular ESL classes in their program to prepare them for such course work.

The participants in the Libyan program had to achieve a score of 80 on the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency before beginning full-time academic study with no further ESL classes. However, the Taiwanese program participants were allowed to begin full- or part-time academic study upon the recommendation of the ELI. This required close and frequent communication between the ELI and the academic department(s) involved in order to determine as nearly as possible the specialized nature of their academic target language.

As participants began academic study on a full-time basis, they and their professors felt that the language training the participants had received had greatly assisted them in meeting their needs for English skill—that is, recommended students made satisfactory academic progress in a typically American instructional program of lectures, laboratories, term papers, and essay and objective tests, even though they may or may not have obtained a standardized English test score high enough for admission.

As more ELI instructors participated in such special programs, specific purpose instruction was discussed more and more at the ELI. An "ESP awareness" was developing. We learned that ESP had been investigated overseas and that ESP materials had been developed mostly overseas long before we started to consider seriously such instruction and research in this country, with extremely few exceptions. One exception was Louis Trimble and his colleagues at the University of Washington, not too many hours' drive from OSU. The ELI arranged for Professor Trimble to give a presentation on ESP teaching at a regional NAFSA workshop sponsored by its professional section ATESL, Association of Teachers of English as a Second Language. Then a campus visit was arranged for Henry Widdowson, chairman of the Department of English for Speakers of Other Languages at the University of London. He presented a staff seminar for the ELI on what ESP teaching might mean for the ESP instructor and student.

During this time, ELI interaction with academic departments of the university had increased, and we were learning a lot about what academic faculty members felt the "real" language needs of foreign students were. They could point to numerous cases of students who had successfully completed study at an intensive English program, but

who were unprepared with respect to the language they actually needed in order to do well in an academic program. It became apparent that something essential was lacking in their regular ESL training.

Special Programs

Gradually, a commitment grew at the ELI to create an internal division of special programs to develop support service systems and curricula to serve the needs of special groups of students coming to the university. We expected not only to better serve university-bound student groups but also to attract groups of students who would go on to study at other institutions or whose programs would be self-contained in the ELI. We expected to benefit from the experiences such groups provide in curriculum development and program administration.

In order to provide opportunities for increased awareness and training for the staff, the first step taken was to gather and study as much as we could about existing ESP activities and materials. We began by purchasing virtually every ESP textbook available from British and American publishers. We increased journal subscriptions. We sought and were awarded a grant from the AID/NAFSA Liaison Committee which provided funding for the establishment of an ESP clearinghouse and ESP newsletter. We had extensive discussions at staff seminars and staff meetings. Staff travel to professional conferences was encouraged (and funded) with the expectation that staff members would bring back increasing amounts of information regarding ESP activities and materials by meeting people active in ESP teaching.

The collection of ESP materials and other developmental activity required a modest commitment of ELI funds, less than the tuition of two full-time students per term. We knew that more funding would be required in order to actually create the division of special programs. We also knew that developmental funding was not available through academic departments or other university units. Consequently, the ELI decided to hire a coordinator of special programs with ELI funding guaranteed for a one-year period after which we expected the division to be self-sustaining financially. However, more funding was required than had been anticipated. In addition to salary expenses, the coordinator of special programs incurred high correspondence, telephone, and printing expenses that steadily increased before we were to see another special program. On the other hand, once the first program arrived, the division rapidly became self-sustaining, and has remained so since.

Because special programs can come and go so rapidly, we developed methods for rapidly expanding the number of instructors, support staff, and administrators to meet program needs. However it was done in such a fashion that it did not compromise quality or cause

grave financial and professional conditions for the extra staff. One way to do this was by forming a network of consultants in various skill areas. They could then be called upon as special programs made funding available for their travel, time, and expertise. It would obviously be expensive to use such a network, but if sufficient funding were available, it could be effective. Although we developed such a network, we used it only occasionally because of the high expense level and problems in getting the right person at the right time and place to serve a program.

Instead, following an alternate plan, we developed a "pool" of ESL instructors who live close to the university and who are able to accept full- or part-time appointments on quite short notice. All pool instructors are expected to be able to teach in special programs or in regular ELI classes in order to free the services of a core instructor (see page 00) for assignment to a special program. Using the following screening criteria, we developed a pool of about twenty qualified ESL instructors who, for a variety of reasons, do not look to the ELI for the primary financial support of themselves or their families. ELI pool instructor positions seem to be much preferred to other available employment opportunities for the pool members.

An applicant to the ESP instructor pool must:

1. Submit a detailed application form including all previous employment and related experience and all education
2. Be willing to accept temporary full- or part-time teaching appointments
3. Be willing to use teaching materials that may not have been selected by them
4. Be willing to accept appointment on very short notice
5. Have native speaker proficiency in English
6. Be able to appear for a personal interview, if requested
7. Have one of the following:
   a. Master's degree and two years of full-time ESL teaching experience
   b. Master's degree in TESL and one year of full-time ESL teaching experience
   c. Bachelor's degree and one year of full-time teaching experience in an intensive English program affiliated with an American college or university
   d. Previous satisfactory teaching experience in the English Language Institute at Oregon State University

Pool instructors have participated in all regular ELI in-service training sessions, special training sessions attached to special programs, and other professional training programs such as summer institutes and regional NAFSA and Oregon TESOL (ORTESOL) conferences.

The regular, or "core," faculty of the ELI are selected according to the following criteria:

1. Applicants are required to submit a detailed application form and at least three letters of reference with regard to the professional capabilities of the applicant.

   In addition, candidates should submit a detailed resume/curriculum vitae including:

   a. All institutions where they have taught English as a second language
   b. Length of time at each of the above institutions and number of class hours taught weekly
   c. Specific courses, proficiency levels, and student populations taught (student nationalities, ages, educational goals, etc.)
   d. Course work taken at any level which directly applies to ESL teaching ability

2. Minimum qualifications for applicants are:
   a. Availability to begin duties in Corvallis *date*
   b. Availability at 1.00 FTE (full-time) for the period *dates*
   c. Master of Arts degree in ESL or a closely related field, such as linguistics, applied linguistics, or English language
   d. Minimum of four years of full-time ESL teaching experience at a postsecondary level intensive English program devoted primarily to English for academic purposes
   e. Demonstrable ability to teach a multilingual group of students
   f. Demonstrable ability to teach in all areas of English language skills (writing, vocabulary, reading, structure, speech, and study skills) at all levels of proficiency (beginning, intermediate, low advanced, high advanced, and university level)
   g. Native speaker proficiency in English
   h. Ability to appear for an interview upon invitation by the screening committee (The ELI pays half the cost)
   i. Willingness to undertake training in the use and development of the ELI language laboratory
   j. Willingness to implement the curriculum of the ELI
   k. A record of harmonious working relationships with colleagues
   l. A record of good rapport with students

3. Preferred qualifications for applicants are:
   a. Experience teaching English for specific purpose classes, such as English for business and economics, English for science and technology, etc.
   b. Administrative experience in ESL programming
   c. Experience teaching in a foreign country/culture
   d. Experience in development of materials for individual study and/or English for specific purpose instruction

Core appointments are made for only one year at a time, but the expectation is that annual appointments will continue, contingent upon satisfactory service and continued funding. Pool appointments are usually written for one academic term at a time subject to the same conditions as continuing core appointments. Initially, a gap was created between the lowest core salary and the pool salary rate, but because the pool instructors have developed professionally and made an increasingly important contribution to the ELI, we hope to close or eliminate this gap.

When the ELI became a part of the university, regular faculty appointments were made available to all ELI instructors. When we started to form the instructor pool, it was suggested that short-term wage agreements might be the most suitable method for hiring pool instructors. However, we mastered the regular appointment procedures of the university in order to make the advantages of regular faculty appointments available to them. By understanding and monitoring the process from the typing of the appointment through all channels to payroll we have smoothed out many of the difficulties inherent in writing or modifying eight to twenty-five sets of appointment papers four times a year. A very important part of this was establishing very good communication between the ELI and the personnel and payroll offices.

Special programs also require varying numbers of support staff such as secretaries, clerks, van drivers, advisers, and program assistants. We learned how to use every kind of employment procedure and category in the university including student employees, work-study employees, ninety-day appointments, the state civil service system, personal service contracts, and academic wage agreements when appropriate. All of our employment procedures were developed in conjunction with the university Affirmative Action director who helped us develop fair procedures.

While the employment procedures were being developed, progress was made in creating the administrative framework for the activities of the division of special programs. We began by deciding what administrative systems would be common to the ELI and the division of special programs and which systems could best be handled by the division itself. For example, all faculty appointments, employment forms, billing, most student information, and accounting functions were centralized in order to have adequate control and accountability for these vital areas.

Teaching assignments, book orders, class schedules, room assignments, program beginning and ending dates, staff meeting times, and all other program scheduling are set jointly by the ELI and division of special programs. This eliminates, or at least diminishes, difficulties that arise when instructors are teaching in both ELI and special pro-

gram classes, i.e., expecting people to be in two different places at the same time. Also, by coordinating schedules, we insure that resources are not strained by having unusually large numbers of students arrive at the same place at the same time.

The division of special programs was made responsible for its program recruitment, contract and budget preparation, curriculum development, support services, and program supervision. Detailed descriptions of the recruiting process and accounting/contract procedures developed are found in "General Procedures for ESP Administration"* and "The Budget's Role in the Administration of ESP Programs."** Basically, financial procedures were developed which were extremely flexible yet sufficiently thorough and justifiable to satisfy both program sponsors and the university business affairs office.

Recruitment proved not to be a problem. Because several university departments are active in international training, the ELI often must provide ESL/ESP programming to groups of students coming to the university. Additionally, we began responding to the many inquiries we had already received suggesting special programs. Previously, we could not take on nonuniversity referred groups but the creation of the division of special programs made it possible to respond to program requests ranging from a "language and culture" program for a group of Japanese undergraduates to a sophisticated English for business and economics program designed for the headquarters staff of a foreign government corporation and presented in cooperation with a nearby community college. We were also able to provide a program proposal to a sponsor wishing to place a group of blind students in the ELI.

Special program supervision has been accomplished through a project director selection and training process. The selection process begins with circulation of a memorandum from the coordinator of special programs to the entire ELI instructor staff. The memo gives as much information as possible about an up-coming program, including information about the members of the group, their goals, their background, time and budget and personnel considerations, and any other pertinent and available information. Core and pool instructors are invited to apply for the project director position. Selection is undertaken by the coordinator of special programs, often in consultation with the ELI coordinator and/or curriculum coordinator.

The coordinator of special programs provides training and support to project directors who are responsible for day-to-day program

**English for Specific Purposes Newsletter*, Issues 12 and 13, Oregon State University, 1978.

***English for Specific Purposes Newsletter*, Issue 17, Oregon State University, 1978.

administration, including communication to and from students, staff, and support service personnel. In practice, not only has this system worked, but it has also produced some very competent staff members who possess a high degree of professionalism both in teaching and in administration.

In 1980, the English Language Institute offered the following classes at six proficiency levels:

English Structure and Writing	6–10 hours/week
Vocabulary and Reading	3–5 hours/week
Speech	3 hours/week
Language Laboratory	5 hours/week
Reading Laboratory	2 + hours/week

Other regularly offered classes included:

Lower levels	
Spelling/Handwriting	2–4 hours/week
Survival (community orientation)	2 hours/week
Upper levels	
Study Skills I	2 hours/week
Study Skills II	2 hours/week
English for Science and Technology	3 hours/week
English for Business and Economics	3 hours/week
Topics in Listening Comprehension	3 hours/week
Typing	3 hours/week

A selection of special program courses offered at the same time would include:

Oral Reporting	2–4 hours/week
Reading for Engineers	3–5 hours/week
Writing for Engineers	3–5 hours/week
English for Business and Economics	3–10 hours/week
English for Management	3–5 hours/week
Conversation (for Japanese)	3–5 hours/week
"Sandwich" classes for certain mathematics and education courses*	6–10 hours/week

We have divided special programs into two groups, "inners" and "outers." Inners are programs which can and do use some or many regular ELI classes, with one or more special classes designed just for that group. Inners must be able to fit into the regular schedule of

*Sandwich classes refer to teaching situations in which an ESL instructor accompanies a group of students during the entire length of an academic course, meeting with the students for an hour before and an hour after each academic class.

the ELI. A program might have to be an inner because of having several different language proficiency levels in the group or because the requirements of the group include a combination of regular and special English.

Outers, on the other hand, might require specific time schedules, support services, and/or curricula that are not provided by the ongoing ELI program. Their instructional program is totally separate from regular classes, as are the related support services. When possible and desired, students in outers are invited to participate in extracurricular social activities of the regular program, which is very often the only point of contact between groups.

An example of an inner is the previously mentioned group of blind students who, in addition to ESL instruction, required extensive support in arranging for apartment rentals, transportation, and orientation training (walking with a "long cane"). Extensive reading services were needed in order to tape their language lessons. Much time was spent locating braille foreign language dictionaries and braille watches, compasses, and calculators. Some of the blind students were accompanied to their ELI classes by in-class readers. The students all enrolled in typing class and typed all their homework assignments. In-class work was done with a braille stylus and the students read their work for evaluation. All examinations were oral. Because of the amount of support services needed, a special program was established and a project director appointed to supervise the orderly and timely provision of services needed by the group.

An example of an outer is the special program we designed for the entire junior class of the English faculty of a major foreign university. The group was not available when ELI classes were regularly scheduled. Also, they required special housing arrangements and food services. They also desired a full complement of extracurricular activities such as sight-seeing and shopping trips.

Other inners and outers included programs offered in cooperation with academic departments of the university, the local adult learning center and a nearby community college. Support services have ranged from providing five-day excursions to locating six pigeons and a cage for one group which included a professional magician!

The ESL/ESP Teacher

This discussion is not intended to express zealotry for ESP instruction, at the expense of ESL instruction. Rather, there is a time and a place for both—indeed they are independent in our ELI. The same is true of teachers; the ESL/ESP teacher is not seen as being in some way "better" than or a replacement for the ESL teacher. There is an important role for both.

The best ESL teachers are those who have a genuine empathy for their students and who are eclectic in their use of teaching methods and materials. The best teachers have a large reservoir of techniques and awareness based on experience from which to draw in designing, preparing, and presenting language instruction that meets the needs and interests of their students.

Admittedly, there has been resistance to ESP instruction on the part of some ESL teachers. Some simply resist change, and a few have reasoned arguments against ESP. But perhaps most do not know much about ESP and may fear that they need to be specialists in the student's field in order to teach ESP. Those of us who have taught ESP classes worried about that, too, to some extent. It is often the case that it takes some experience before one can develop successful strategies for teaching students the language as distinct from the content of any particular discipline.

More and more students will seek nontraditional English instruction—and not only ESP instruction. New techniques are needed such as the sandwich classes and reading laboratories. Students believe these and other new classes help them acquire the language skills, study skills, acculturation skills, and background information needed to support their academic goals. We hope that this account of our experiences may help others who are or will be engaged in conducting special programs.

The ESL Learning Laboratory

Joseph H. Sheehan

Learning resources consist not only of people and places, but also of hardware (e.g., overhead projectors and TV) and software (e.g., texts, tapes, and puppets). IEP administrators must be sure that the hardware and software are appropriate and effective for their programs. The professional staff, with the guidance of the administration, should select those resources which help the student attain the instructional objectives of the program. The teacher is the mediator between the student's present competency and the objectives, and prescribes the media (software and hardware) to be used by the class or by the individual student. It should be stressed, however, that learning resources are not limited to the classroom and to the teachers' and students' use therein of overhead projectors, tape recorders, and other hardware.

Learning Laboratories and Language Laboratories

In the same way that the physical, social, and business sciences provide laboratories for students to learn in, so, too, can the language program offer laboratories where students (as a class or individually) are introduced to new subject matter or where the subject matter they have learned is reinforced or extended. Such a learning laboratory consists of software and usually hardware, the most common type being the *language laboratory*.

The language laboratory in its basic elements consists of a listening system where a class works as a unit by listening to the same program (the *broadcast* system), or where individual students work on separate programs (the *library* system). Beginning and low-intermediate students seem to benefit more from the broadcast system because they can be more easily guided, monitored, and evaluated.

The hardware might be of three functional types: (1) audio passive—the student merely listens through earphones; (2) audio active—the

student uses a headset with microphone and thus hears himself electronically; and (3) audio active comparative—the student listens through a headset, records his own utterances, and replays his recording to compare his work with that of the model, or to check the accuracy of his responses. (For more details, see Stack, 1971.)

Evaluations of the traditional language laboratory are reviewed in Appendix 4 of Chastain, 1976, and in Green, 1975. For a justification of the laboratory, see *Audio in the 1970's*, 1971, especially Wilga Rivers' paper on speech perception. The utilization and often the selection of the equipment should be influenced by the objectives of the program as well as by the software to be used.

Hardware and Software

Once the system, broadcast or library, is decided on, one must select the hardware. Library media specialists can be helpful even if they specialize in learning laboratories rather than *language* laboratories. Ideally, one would secure the services of a consultant who is qualified as an ESL teacher and laboratory technician, as well as a language laboratory director.*

Currently, one should expect to pay approximately $1,000 per student position for a new language laboratory. The *Audio-Visual Equipment Directory* gives list prices as well as other information about equipment. One can expect a discount on the larger systems.

Many teachers feel that there is a lack of "good" software, especially in laboratory materials. As can be seen from the catalogs of tape suppliers advertising in the *TESOL Quarterly*, most tapes accompany textbooks. In selecting textbooks with accompanying tapes for an instructional program, one should listen to the tapes and have them evaluated not only for content but for distortion, wow and flutter, length, rate of speech, quality and variety of speech (American or non-American English). It is not advisable to select a text for which the publisher will not give written permission to duplicate the recordings to make student copies. With regard to copyrights, one may consult the 1977 publication of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.

Textbooks should be selected for use for more than one semester so that they become familiar to the staff, who, over a period of time,

*One can seek a consultant through Charles P. Richardson, Executive Director, International Association for Learning Laboratories (IALL), Language Laboratories, Ellis Hall, College of Arts and Sciences, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio 45701. The consultant can help the administrator decide on the relevancy of the laboratory choices, e.g., half track vs. quarter track tape machines, portable vs. fixed laboratory equipment, cassette vs. open reel, and library vs. broadcast systems. The consultant can also indicate where various types of laboratories are in operation.

can evaluate the materials' effectiveness and appropriateness. Tape scripts and teachers' manuals should be purchased, to insure that the software is used as its authors intended. New or inexperienced staff members should be given guidance before embarking on a tape production project, especially in the areas of obtaining the publisher's permission for the use of exercises from the text and determining the academic justification for the selection of material to be taped. For such projects, Higgins, 1969, would be of value.

The next step is to determine the role of the software. Are the media to be introduced to the students in the classroom or the laboratory? Is the role of the software to prepare the student for a class? To reinforce what has been taught in the class? Or is it to extend and expand that which has been taught? In this regard, consult E. Turner, 1969, and J. Turner, 1968.

The above is an outline of the hardware, software, and utilization of the traditional language laboratory. Currently, these laboratories are being expanded and/or augmented by other nongroup media for the individual, e.g., filmstrip projector, TV, card reader (Language Master), speech compressor/expander, and computer terminal. These media may often be used in conjunction with the language laboratory or may constitute a separate learning resource laboratory where students work on individual tasks, such as programmed texts. One kind of laboratory facility, an English skills laboratory, is described in Pack, 1979.

The operation of both the language laboratory and the individual media laboratory depends not only on the guidelines set by the administration (regarding, for example, hours per week of use, cost effectiveness, space, scheduling, discipline, and attendance policics) but also on the staff and the selection of that staff.

Personnel

In order to be fully effective, a language laboratory should have, at the very least, a qualified supervisor or director and laboratory instructors or monitors. The supervisor/director should be knowledgeable about language learning as well as language learning technology and should also be a competent administrator. Thus, to put a student—even a graduate student—in charge of the language laboratory is to court disaster.

The selection of the software should be made by someone thoroughly knowledgeable about media and ESL subject matter. The supervisor should be responsible for the training of the laboratory staff, but not necessarily for their education in TEFL. On the other hand, laboratory monitors/instructors are usually regular classroom teachers or graduate teaching assistants; occasionally they are under-

graduate students who are employed on work-study programs. In any event, although a laboratory may be staffed by paraprofessional monitors, only a professional should make the assignments and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the media. Many self-instructional ESL materials are self-correcting and have answers supplied in the textbook or workbook. Other software may require a personal evaluation of the student's response to a task by a monitor.

Evaluation

Some media provide a means for student self-evaluation, as in a language laboratory which broadcasts the task to the student, turns on the student's machine to record only that student's response, and turns the machine off within a given time frame. Some systems require the student to pass a criterion test and to be directed to further programmed tasks according to the results at each step.

The staff in the laboratory should have a means to feed back the students' progress reports to the person making the assignments (usually the classroom teacher who is coordinating the laboratory work with the class work or with the needs of individual students).

Recent Media Developments

New laboratory consoles have many features, such as "teacher logic" programming and a capability for two people to monitor different students. However, many features are optional and should not be included unless they can be strongly justified, for the more features a system contains, the greater the potential for technical problems. A consultant can suggest what is necessary, questionable, or useless for a particular program.

Some laboratories now include a video component, which allows the student to view a videotape, record its soundtrack, and write answers to questions based on it, among other activities. Successful telecourses in ESL are, to say the least, rare. There are, however, videotapes which demonstrate nonverbal aspects of communication as well as paralinguistic cues. If the video elicits an oral response from the student, then at least an audio-active system should be used in the laboratory so that the student may hear his or her response clearly.

Control of the rate of speech has been an almost insurmountable problem until recently, thanks to a technological spin-off from the U.S. space program—pitch control. With pitch control, it is possible to have intelligible speech which is varied in speed; the "grumble" and the "chipmunk" distortions are removed, allowing for expanded speech about one-half normal rate or compressed speech about two-and-one-half times normal rate. The pioneering study on second language acquisition in Flaherty, 1975, demonstrates the effect of speech expan-

sion on listening comprehension performance. In addition, the seminal work of Bruns, 1978, on time-compressed speech in second language acquisition is of particular import because it was done in an intensive English program.

The video disc is a recent European development in audiovisual technology. A disc similar to a phonograph record allows easy access to any part of the disc. Some systems can store 50,000 slide pictures, or frames, on a disc and display them one at a time or in rapid sequence like a movie film. The playing of the record produces video images with sound. To produce one's own program is difficult, and very expensive, and there seems to be little immediate advantage to ESL in the video disc.

Computer-based education (CBE) may be viewed as computer-assisted instruction (CAI) or computer-managed instruction (CMI). In CAI, the software is the computer program and the hardware the computer with terminal input/output. The most extensively used computerized ESL materials are found in PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations). In CMI the software consists of the computer program and other software as well as hardware of other media. The computer directs the student to the other media, tests and evaluates the results, and programs the next step. Information about PLATO can be obtained from the Control Data Education Company in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

For many IEP programs these last mentioned features and developments may seem far in the future. They are not. Technology has already outdistanced the teacher in many respects. It is there for the asking, but the teacher and the administrator must ask.

Conclusion

The learning laboratory is more than hardware and software. To benefit from it the student must:

1. Be cognitively and affectively prepared by the classroom teacher
2. Know what is expected
3. Work on materials that are appropriate to his or her level
4. Work on materials that are a means to obtaining the instructional goals set forth by the teacher
5. Be evaluated on work in the laboratory

If the above is done, then it is not unreasonable to expect that a student could:

1. Be aware of voices and dialects other than those of his or her teachers
2. Develop echoic memory
3. Take responsibility for performing a task thoroughly
4. Develop an awareness of what English usage is correct

5. Apply what has been learned in the classroom to new tasks
6. Extend what has been learned in the classroom to new situations
7. Recognize grapheme-phoneme correspondences more skillfully
8. Increase general aural comprehension

Of course, long before there were language laboratories students learned English as a second language. Nonetheless, language learning might now be made more efficient and effective. The technology is here, available in a bewildering array of hardware, complete with tried and tested machines and trendy gimmicks. As Alexander Pope says in *Essays on Criticism:* Be not the first by whom the new are tried, nor yet the last to lay the old aside.

References

Association for Educational Communications and Technology. *Copyright and Educational Media: A Guide to Fair Use and Permissions Procedures.* Washington, D.C.: AECT, 1977.

Audio-Visual Language Association. *Audio-Visual Language Journal.*

Bruns, Robert W. "A Study of the Effects of Practice in Time-Compressed Speech Listening upon Aural Comprehension Levels of Second Language Learners." Diss. University of Colorado, 1978.

Bulletin Cila: Organe De La Commission Interuniversitaire Suisse De Linguistique Appliquee. Neuchatel, Switzerland: Institut de Linguistique.

Chastain, Kenneth. *The Development of Modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice.* 2nd rev. ed. New York: The Center for Curriculum Development, 1976.

Communication and Language Arts Division—Brigham Young University. *TESL* (Teaching English as a Second Language) *Reporter.*

Dakin, Julian. *The Language Laboratory and Language Learning.* London: University of London Press, 1968.

Davidson, Walter F. *The Language Laboratory: A Bibliography,* 1950-1972. Pittsburgh: University Center for International Studies and the English Language Institute, 1973.

Flaherty, Etienne. "The Effect of Time Expansion on Listening Comprehension of High School Students in Second Year French Classes." *The Center for Rate-Controlled Recordings Newsletter,* Vol. 9, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1975.

Green, Peter S., ed. *The Language Laboratory in School: Performance and Prediction.* New York: Oliver & Boyd, 1975.

Hart, Robert F., ed. "The PLATO System and Language Study." *Studies in Language Learning,* Vol. 3, No. 1.

Higgins, J.J. *A Guide to Language Laboratory Material Writing.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1969.

Hutchinson, Joseph C. and June O. "Criteria for Selecting Types of Foreign Language Laboratory Systems." *ERIC: Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.* No. 20, 1971.

Jones, Judith, ed. *The Videolog: Programs for General Interest and Entertainment 1979.*

Kenner, Roger, ed. Proceedings of the Concordia Colloquium on Language Laboratories 1981. SPEAQ Journal, Vol. 4, No. 3.

Medley, Frank W. "Maintenance of the Language Laboratory." *ERIC: Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.* No. 28, 1973.

National Association of Learning Lab Directors. *NALLD Journal.*

National Center for Audio Tapes 1974-1976 Catalog and Supplement.

Pack, Alice. "The English Skills Lab." *TESL Reporter,* Spring 1979.

Proceedings of DLI Working Conference. *Audio in the 1970's: Role and Potential in Language Training*. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Defense Language Institute, 1971.

Proceedings of the Foreign Language Education and Technology (FLEAT) Conference, 1981. Language Laboratory Association of Japan. Meiji Gakuin University, Tokyo.

Stack, Edward M. *The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Stack, Edward M. "The Mechanical Potential of the Language Laboratory." *ERIC: Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*. No. 14. 1970.

System: The International Journal of Educational Technology and Language Learning Systems.

The Audio-Visual Equipment Directory. Fairfax, Va.: National Audio-Visual Association.

Turner, E. Daymond, Jr. "Correlation of Language Class and Language Laboratory." *ERIC: Focus Reports on the Teaching of Foreign Languages*. No. 13. 1969.

Turner, John D., ed. *Programming for the Language Laboratory*. London: University of London Press, 1968.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. *Field Check Manual for Language Laboratories*. 1964.

A Guide to References in ESL Methodology for the Intensive Program

Ralph Pat Barrett

It would be folly to attempt to cover a subject as potentially vast as ESL methodology in a single article, even in a superficial manner. Also, there is the assumption that the reader is a trained ESL practitioner and hardly needs a rundown of basic teaching techniques. Therefore, what follows is a very brief guide to references which the reader might find useful in compiling a small reference library of texts on general ESL methodology. Such a library would be expecially useful for in-service teacher training and curriculum planning, in addition to its being a general gold mine of techniques and other ideas for overextended and overworked teachers.

Using Edward M. Anthony's widely accepted definitions of "approach," "method," and "technique" (Anthony, 1963), it is clear that what the teacher does in the classroom is considered a set of "techniques" which together constitute a "method" (which itself is consistent with the theoretical assumptions about language learning contained in the "approach"). Among different approaches to language teaching currently being used, there are the direct method, the grammar-translation approach, the audio-lingual (or aural-oral) approach, the "cognitive code" approach, and a variety of newer interpersonally and sociologically based approaches (Silent Way, Counseling-Learning, Community Language Learning, etc.). See Brown ("From Theory to Practice") for a good review of these approaches.

To begin with, it is assumed that different ESL teaching techniques are called for when teaching students at different proficiency levels and of different ages or levels of maturity. For example, a teacher would be expected to use teaching techniques which are suited to the

students themselves, rather than basing them on predetermined criteria which do not take into account the students' age and language proficiency level. And rather than attempt to catalog all of the different techniques appropriate to students of different groups, levels, and ages, the better part of valor suggests the presentation of a list of texts describing the methods and techniques to be used with a variety of student types.

The titles listed below were derived primarily from "A Bare-Bones Bibliography for Teachers of ESL" by John Haskell, in the December 1979 *TESOL Newsletter*. Sixteen well-known ESL professionals offered the titles of the ten texts which they would recommend as an initial guide to the beginning ESL teacher. Naturally, many of these texts deal with the fundamentals of ESL methodology; those that appeared to be relevant to the type of teaching typically done in an intensive English program are presented below. Some additional titles, published since 1979, supplement the "Bare Bones" list, but this listing is not meant to be all-inclusive; for example, no texts on ESL testing or other specialized areas are included. The texts are presented in alphabetical order by author.

Allen, Edward D. and Rebecca M. Valette. *Classroom Techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a Second Language*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.

*Allen, Harold B. and Russell N. Campbell, editors. *Teaching English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Billows, F.L. *The Techniques of Foreign Language Teaching*. London: Longman, 1961.

Broughton, G., C. Brumfit, R. Flavell, P. Hill and A. Pincas. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.

Brown, H. Douglas. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Burt, Marina K., Heidi C. Dulay, and Mary Finocchiaro, editors. *Viewpoints on English as a Second Language*. New York: Regents, 1977.

Byrne, Donn. *Teaching Oral English*. London: Longman, 1976.

Celce-Murcia, Marianne and Lois McIntosh, editors. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1979.

Chastain, Kenneth. *Developing Second-Language Skills: Theory to Practice*, second edition. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976.

Close, R.A. *English as a Foreign Language*, second edition. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1977.

*Croft, Kenneth, editor. *Readings on English as a Second Language*, second edition. Cambridge: Winthrop, 1980.

Dacanay, Fe R. *Techniques and Procedures in Second-Language Teaching*. Quezon City, Luzon, Philippines: Phoenix Press, 1963.

Dobson, Julia. *Effective Techniques for English Conversation Groups*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1974.

Dubin, Fraida and Elite Olshtain. *Facilitating Language Learning: A Guidebook for the ESL/EFL Teacher*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Finocchiaro, M. and M. Bonomo. *The Foreign Language Learner: A Guide for Teachers*. New York: Regents, 1973.

*Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Gallwey, Timothy. *The Inner Game of Tennis*. New York: Random House, 1974.
Gurrey, P. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. London: Longman, 1955.
Hatch, Evelyn, editor. *Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1978.
Ilyin, Donna and Thomas Tragardh, editors. *Classroom Practices in Adult ESL*. Washington, DC: TESOL, 1978.
Joiner, Elizabeth and Patricia Westphal. *Developing Communication Skills*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1978.
Lado, Robert. *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
Maley, C.A. and A. Duff. *Drama Techniques in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
Newton, Anne, compiler. *The Art of TESOL, Parts 1 and 2*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1978.
*Paulston, Christina B. and Mary N. Bruder. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge: Winthrop, 1976.
Politzer, Robert L. *Foreign Language Learning: A Linguistic Introduction*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
Rivers, Wilga M. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
*Rivers, Wilga M. and Mary S. Temperley. *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
*Robinett, Betty W. *Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages: Substance and Technique*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
Stevick, Earl. *Adapting and Writing Language Lessons*. Washington, DC: Foreign Service Institute, 1971.
*Stevick, Earl. *Memory, Meaning and Method*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1976.
*Stevick, Earl. *Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury, 1980.
Thonis, Eleanor W. *Teaching Reading to Non-English Speakers*. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
Valdman, Albert, editor. *Trends in Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
Via, Richard A. *English in Three Acts*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1976.
*Widdowson, Henry G. *Teaching Language as Communication*, second edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.
Wilkins, D.A. *Second-Language Learning and Teaching*. London: Edward Arnold, 1974.

*Those books which were most often selected by the "Bare Bones" Sixteen are indicated with an asterisk.

Note: The two articles below treat the general topic of approach, method, and technique:

Anthony, Edward M. "Approach, Method, and Technique," *English Language Teaching* 17 (January 1963): 63-67.
Anthony, Edward M. and William E. Norris, "Method in Language Teaching," in *Readings on English as a Second Language*, editor, K. Croft (Cambridge: Winthrop, 1972), pp. 39-48.

Testing and Evaluation

Student Evaluation

Paul J. Angelis

In any intensive English program, whether large or small, there is need for testing and evaluation. In general terms this refers to the need for measuring how students differ from each other in their ability to use English. Probably more than in any other aspect of an English training program, however, it is important to go beyond this general goal and consider specific questions involving testing in order to distinguish one type of measurement need from another. Doing so will permit us to discuss the different types of tests which serve to meet these various needs and to introduce the terms most commonly used in discussions of language testing. From there we can proceed to describe some major tests in use, referring where appropriate to information supplied by the producers of those tests. In the final section of this chapter, we will summarize by outlining a number of guidelines to consider in implementing any testing program. Much of what is contained here stresses the caution to be followed in using tests and gives recommendations for designing, administering, and interpreting tests within the framework of an intensive English program. Following the chapter is a list of references for further information on language testing both of a general and technical nature.

Types of Testing

One way of looking at testing within an English program is to consider the situation from a chronological point of view. When a group of new students arrives to begin training, it is usually the case that they will vary in their ability to use English. There may be occasions when some students are classified from the start as rank beginners, i.e., they are not able to use English at all. This is the one case where very little need be done to ascertain the level of the students. These who cannot understand the simplest questions or cannot even respond with basic statements can usually be placed in the lowest instructional level. This

assumes, of course, that there is enough time to derive this information. If eighty new students arrive on a given date with no advance indication of level of English proficiency, there is probably no way to quickly determine which, if any, are beginners. Furthermore, too hasty a screening procedure can lead to wrong decisions about where a student should be placed.

Placement is the key to this first type of testing. The purpose is to *place* students in the appropriate level of instruction. Two basic kinds of tests are generally used: standardized proficiency tests or program-related tests. Standardized proficiency tests are those which are designed with a wide audience in mind, are based on no particular curriculum, and usually present results in the form of a score scale which can apply to students in a number of different programs. Such tests are useful for giving an overall initial indication of a student's knowledge of English. They are particularly helpful when a program is able to compare results of one group of students with those of previous groups. Based on experience over time, results from such proficiency tests can provide at least a broad estimate of the type and length of training a given student will require to reach a desired level of proficiency. One reason for this is that these are frequently the same tests which are given at the end of a period of training to provide one indication of whether or not students have reached the desired goal.

Program-related tests on the other hand are more closely related to the curriculum of a given English training program. Ideally, such tests are developed by putting together samples of material taken from all of the different levels of instruction in the program. The basic idea is a very simple one. Finding out at what point a student begins to have difficulty in a progressive series of tasks designed to parallel the course of instruction should indicate the level at which he or she should be placed. Program-related tests of this type assume a fairly well-knit curriculum and do require that the tests in question be developed in-house, rather than relying on tests already available from outside sources. But assuming that trained staff are available within an English program to design such tests and keep them in tune with any changes in the instructional side of the program, program-related tests represent the best alternative to providing adequate, meaningful placement measures.

After placement, what type of evaluation needs to be built into an English program? Again, the type of testing is determined by the questions to be asked. At the start the primary question was where the student should be placed. After a given period of training the most prominent question is how much the student has learned. As might be expected, the most direct approach to responding to such a question is based on the material to be learned. That would be represented

by an in-house test, i.e., a test or series of tests prepared by program staff and built around those segments of the curricula covered by the students. While commercial or standardized tests can be used to provide general benchmarks on which to judge individual and group performance during a program, the information yielded by administrations of such tests generally do not provide data sufficiently related to the specific work done in a given segment of training.

The achievement tests in question can be designed from two different, but complementary, points of view. Since some of the work which goes on in an English training program includes increased familiarization with elements of the language (grammar, vocabulary, etc.), achievement tests can be built around a selection of items representative of the material used in the classroom. One caution, of course, is that simply reusing exercises from what has already been used in teaching is inappropriate. What is required is the same content, but in a different context. Good teaching exercises are not necessarily good testing items and vice versa.

The second approach to achievement testing is to focus on students' performance of certain skills which require them to put together the various aspects of English which they have been exposed to in separate segments of the curriculum. This is easier to accomplish if the program has been set up with a situational performance base. This means that the program has been divided into certain sequences at the end of which students are expected to perform specific tasks. The key to such an option lies in how well the tasks are specified and how close the link is between the classroom teaching and the performance expected.

Proceeding to a further stage in the course of training, the question is asked: Are the students ready to complete the program? Do they have enough skills in English to leave the intensive program and begin the work for which they need English? In most cases, this means academic work of some sort, since the majority of the students in English programs are learning the language prior to beginning an academic program. Here we are no longer speaking of placement, nor are we concerned with how well students have mastered a portion of the curriculum. Rather than placement or achievement tests, we are now speaking of proficiency tests.

Here again a distinction can be made between program-based tests and standardized tests. Because we are now talking about the late stages in a program, however, the preference goes toward the latter. Whereas in the previous stages these tests were listed as options, the most meaningful results were explained as coming from tests which had a direct link to the English program in question. By the time the students reach the end of the program, the overriding issue shifts from their standing within a program to their ability to use English in

relation to other students, even students in other programs. It is in this respect that standardized tests are of greatest value.

Choice of Tests

Tests developed for use within a particular English program are rarely of use within other English programs. This is the very nature of these instruments. The more useful they are in testing the content of a particular curriculum, the less likely they are to be of use in other programs. Proficiency tests, on the other hand, are designed with no particular curriculum in mind. For some time now English programs in the United States have made use of three major standardized tests made available from three separate sources. The first is the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency developed and distributed by the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan. Because of the long-standing reputation of this test within English teaching circles, it is used by many programs as a general measure of English proficiency, particularly at the end of a session. However, in using the Michigan Test and in interpreting references to it, one must distinguish between the Michigan Test and the Michigan Battery. The test itself is a standardized, multiple-choice test with two basic parts. The first measures listening comprehension, and the second, a combination of language elements and skills including grammar, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. The battery includes this test plus a writing sample. As designed and used at the University of Michigan, the full battery, combined with teacher evaluations, forms an overall measure of proficiency in English for students who are not native speakers of the language. The test can be used by other institutions and materials are available from the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan for that purpose. Since the test has been in use for a number of years, there are a number of different forms, or editions, of the test available. In using the Michigan Test within an English program, guidelines provided by the University of Michigan on the choice of forms and interpretations of results should be followed.

A second test widely used by English programs is the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) produced by Educational Testing Service (ETS). Many programs choose to give this test at regular intervals or at certain times during the year since it is the TOEFL which is most widely used by colleges and universities seeking an indication of English proficiency for foreign students applying to academic programs. Just as with the Michigan Test, some distinctions need to be made in discussing the formats under which the TOEFL is given. Since the primary purpose of the TOEFL is to provide colleges and universities with an indication of the English proficiency of prospective students, it is important that the forms of the test used at regular administrations throughout the world be secure. A different form of

the TOEFL is, therefore, used for each of the administrations given monthly at centers around the world. Students must register for these administrations in advance and usually have their scores sent to the colleges and universities which they select. In addition to the international administrations, the TOEFL is also used in institutional systems. Here institutions, mostly English training programs, order materials and administer the test to their students on dates they select. In certain cases scoring keys are available, but with or without the use of scoring keys by the institutions, score rosters are returned by ETS indicating the total score and the subscores on each of three sections: Listening Comprehension, Structure and Written Expression, and Reading and Vocabulary. The forms available are those which have already been used in international administrations.

Probably the other most widely used general proficiency test is the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT). This test is available in published form from McGraw-Hill Book Company and can, therefore, be used on a very flexible schedule by English programs. The CELT is actually composed of three separate tests measuring listening comprehension, structure, and vocabulary.

General Guidelines

If a program develops its own placement or achievement tests, it will presumably have information available to interpret the results of those tests. When using any standardized tests, whether obtained each time the test is administered or in multiple permanent copies from a publisher, all interpretive information provided by the producer of the test should be reviewed and used as a guide to making any decisions based on test scores. For standardized tests such as the ones described, careful attention should be paid to any information provided concerning the nature of the scores and scoring system used. In no case is it sufficient to look only at the number of questions the student(s) answered correctly (raw scores). Nor is it usually adequate to view test results in terms of percentages, e.g., 80 correct out of 110 equals 73 percent. In all cases the most meaningful information comes from looking at scores which have been adjusted in some way to account for factors such as the differences that may exist from one form of the test to the next or the differences in the groups which have taken the test on other occasions. Most test producers account for these factors by a variety of techniques, all of which result in methods for converting the *raw scores* to what are usually called *equated* or *scaled scores*. These are the scores to use when interpreting test results.

A second point to consider is what effect there may be from simple variations in testing situations. Even if a group of students took a test on more than one occasion under very similar circumstances, the results would rarely come out exactly the same. There is a predictable

range for every test which indicates how much variation can be expected due to such factors. This is called the *standard error of measurement*. Only by knowing this range for a given test can results be adequately interpreted. One important point to keep in mind in this connection is that student's scores can drop from one administration to the next without any real deterioration in ability.

Especially when considering test results over a period of time, it is important to keep in mind that the language learning process is not a continuous one and that even test results can indicate periods when students have reached a learning plateau. That is, their rate of development in the new language will typically not be as rapid as when they first began. Since this is not a discussion of language learning processes or the reasons for these phenomena, suffice it to say that there is an explanation for what otherwise appears to be an unusual pattern of test performance.

Finally, since the purpose of designing a testing component for an English language program is not only to provide a means of evaluating a given student but also of evaluating groups of students, and, to some degree, the effectiveness of the program, it is essential that records be kept. Only by reviewing detailed long-term patterns of test performance can those administering a program make even the most general observations about how their students have performed. These observations can then in turn provide a general framework in which to consider how well a program is meeting its objectives. In the case of the individual student, test results remain only a part of a profile of language ability. In addition, we must add any additional information, particularly related to social or psychological factors such as motivation and overall ease in using the language. Testing is a part of evaluation but only one part, and evaluation is only one phase of the teaching–learning situation which forms the basis of any English program.

References

Allen, J. P. B. and Alan Davies. *Testing and Experimental Methods*. London: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Briere, Eugene and Frances Hinofotis. *Concepts in Language Testing: Some Recent Studies*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1979.

Carroll, Brendan. *Testing Communicative Performance*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1980.

Clark, John L. D. *Foreign Language Testing: Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Cohen, Andrew. *Testing Language Ability in the Classroom*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980.

Davies, Alan. *Language Testing Symposium: A Psycholinguistic Approach*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Harris, David. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Heaton, J. B. *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman, 1975.

Jones, Randall L. and Bernard Spolsky. *Testing Language Proficiency*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975.

Lado, Robert. *Language Testing*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Oller, John W. and Kyle Perkins. *Language in Education: Testing the Tests*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978.

Oller, John and Kyle Perkins. *Research in Language Testing*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980.

Palmer, Leslie and Bernard Spolsky, eds. *Papers on Language Testing: 1967–1974*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL, 1975.

Spolsky, Bernard. *Advances in Language Testing*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1979.

Upshur, John and Julia Fata. *Problems in Foreign Language Testing*. Special Issue Number 3 of *Language Learning*, 1968.

Valette, Rebecca. *Modern Language Testing*, 2nd Edition. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1977.

The Evaluation of an Intensive English Program

Milton G. Saltzer

This will not be a "scholarly" presentation, replete with citations from articles in the area of evaluation of ESL programs. Probably few such exist in any case. Instead, it will be an attempt to reflect on, and organize, some of the experience gained in directing the activities of one of the largest and most variegated and complex university-based intensive English language programs in the country. The analysis of the evaluation process suggested here derives directly from over fifteen years of experience as an ESL program administrator. To the extent that the reader can discern some similarity between his own program and this one, he may concur in the generalizations offered; in any case, he may draw his own inferences as to their validity in his own situation.

An ESL program may be evaluated from several points of view, including those of the supervisory unit (or parent institution), the program's own administration, its faculty, its students, and external agencies. Each of these evaluations may be made from the standpoint of fiscal, administrative, and academic criteria. It may be expected that there will be differences in evaluative criteria among state-sponsored institutions, private institutions, two- and four-year colleges, undergraduate- and graduate-oriented schools, institutions with narrowly defined academic interests (e.g., engineering and technological schools), and schools that are "bilingual" in nature. In some cases, evaluatory criteria will differ as the result of legislated requirements or institutional policies, but in every case, it is the personal bent of the evaluator, as interpreter of the data, which determines which criteria will receive priority in any particular situation.

Evaluation I: The View of the Supervisory Unit

Fiscal Criteria

The pressures of rising costs and decreasing registrations on university budgets during the 1970s, especially in the latter half, brought about major changes in the evaluation of ESL programs. Curiously, but understandably, those changes moved in diametrically opposing directions.

On the one hand, institutions with established programs, which had in the past viewed their ESL programs only in terms of their ability to prepare international students to work well in their academic degree studies, now began to look hard at fiscal viability. Whereas once there was a prideful glance at that little program somewhere in a corner of the campus that fed colorful and interesting students into the academic classrooms, now there were careful examinations of costs. The "every tub on its own bottom" syndrome became relevant, and presidents, budget officers, and management-by-objective deans placed evaluative priority on fiscal considerations.

These considerations varied, of course, with newly created criteria. The program was to meet its direct costs; or to make a "return to overhead" (that is, show a profit); or to make a specified percentage return to overhead. State legislatures became aware of ESL programs and described international students as "in-staters" or "out-of-staters" (predominantly the latter) for tuition purposes. Private institutions began to pressure for "a better financial picture." Generally, the programs that operated at a loss and required subsidization were imperiled.

On the other hand, the drop in university registration of domestic students and, in this regard, the dim demographic projections for the 1980s brought the international student to the attention of admissions office recruiters. Various overseas political situations, OPEC subsidization of postsecondary education in the U.S. for students from OPEC countries, and the interest of developing countries in the creation of a technological and managerial segment of society—all combined with the continuing depreciation of the dollar in relation to foreign currencies, suddenly produced a leap in the numbers of international students arriving in the U.S. This newly found and seemingly limitless resource was viewed by many financially tottering institutions as heaven-sent. But ESL was needed for these students. The agencies contracting to handle the hundreds deplaning weekly felt that placement of too large a contingent of any one national group on any one campus was undesirable.

As a result, many postsecondary institutions established new ESL programs; they mushroomed all over the country. Their value, to the institutions, lay not so much in their internal fiscal viability as in their

being feeders into two- and four-year degree programs. During this time a new phenomenon arose, the franchise ESL program. The franchise operation was a boon to many marginal and struggling schools, whose dormitories, cafeterias, and classrooms were now filled with unexpected occupants and whose academic programs found continued existence. But the evaluation of some of these ESL programs tended to depend primarily on enrollment figures rather than academic considerations.

Administration Criteria

From the viewpoint of the supervisory unit, the evaluation of the administration of an ESL program is closely related to fiscal evaluation. How tightly is the program run in terms of utilization of time—the sheer number of hours devoted to administration and/or teaching? What is the proportion of full-time to part-time faculty? Is there a tenure situation or other suitable job security arrangement for full-time faculty? What academic ranks do the faculty hold? How much office space is required for the program and how much classroom space (and of what quality) for a program or course whose dollar income per hour of classroom square footage is lower than that of an academic program or course?

The extent to which the administration, per se, of an ESL program is examined and evaluated depends largely on its placement for supervisory purposes (reporting to an institutional vice president, to the dean of a school, or to a department chairman). The program's size and importance within its supervisory unit's budget make it subject to more or less scrutiny. Programs that are franchised, of course, are usually administratively free within their own shops and are subject to evaluation only within their own hierarchy.

Academic Criteria

Academic evaluation of an ESL program by its administrative supervisor should be utterly critical; it rarely is, however, because the essential criterion is not subject to precise measurement. How well—or poorly—does the student, released by the program as "prepared for full-time degree study" actually perform in his academic course work? The large numbers of ESL students who move from ESL study in one school to degree study in another school are usually totally lost sight of; statistics on their performance are almost impossible to come by. As to those who remain within the same institution, how much follow-up and data collection are performed? Usually, very little. Institutions whose foreign student advisers are involved in course recommendation and advisement and who keep records on the numbers of international students who succeed in obtaining degrees have of course a raw form of academic evaluation. But numerous factors in academic

success or failure are extraneous to language proficiency and make this raw evaluation most suspect.

What remains then, is the evaluation of individual faculty members in the academic departments, whose opinions may be highly subjective, either broad approving generalizations or adversely critical carping based on experiences with one or another international student. Neither is appropriate evaluation, but either may have strong effect on the ESL program's reputation on the campus.

Another criterion for the administration's evaluation of a program is the image it projects through the external activity of its faculty. The number of texts and articles published, the number of presentations at conferences, the number and type of positions elected to in the various ESL associations and organizations, national and local—all are "credited" to the program's image and indirectly enhance the institutional status of the supervising administrator.

Evaluation II: The View of the Program's Administration

Fiscal Criteria

The ESL program director makes, quite appropriately, a fiscal evaluation of the program very similar to that of the administrative supervisor. Is the projected budget being met, in income, and when required, in direct expense? If not, as to shortfall or excess, is the ratio between the two sides, nevertheless, as projected? Is the "return to overhead" in the projected dollar amount? Did the anticipated number of students register, and did they enroll for the courses projected? Did the expected proportion of "I-20 students" arrive as against the number of I-20s issued? Was recruiting successful? Did contract groups come in as expected? In short, will the program's income satisfy the supervisory evaluator?

And as to expense, were new faculty members recruited within budget limitations? Were operating expenses kept within projected restraints? Is there money available to replace those three worn-out typewriters? How much of a fight will the next budget session entail?

Administrative Criteria

The program director's priority evaluation has to do with the feasibility of the directorship's responsibilities and functions—are they "doable"? Is the work-load tolerable but not overwhelming? Was there time available to think? Or was help needed, of an administrative, or academic, or a clerical nature? The importance of this type of evaluation must be stressed, because it is inevitable that a program will take on the imprint of its director's personality, capability, and effectiveness in performing the needed functions; every program reflects its director.

The day-to-day operation of a program may be evaluated in terms of smoothness of performance. The reverse is perhaps more measurable—how much hassle is there? To what extent is the amount of hassle inevitable? Is it bearable? How much can be eliminated? Are students being handled in testing for placement at registration time and at end-of-term in a manner that is both efficient and gracious? Are student complaints attended to promptly and with discretion? Are administration's relations with faculty authoritative yet friendly? Is there a faculty *esprit* that leads to accurate, timely, and efficient performance of administrative chores? Is there faculty-clerical harmony? Is there intraclerical peace of such a nature that the necessary dovetailing of work is quietly and well done?

What about the program's relationship with the other components of the school? Does the program have that degree of respect from the academic divisions that its recommendation concerning a student's language proficiency is regarded as accurate and authoritative? Within the administrative hierarchy of the school, does the program's administration have sufficient clout (or personal relationships) to "get things done"—move the personnel office; influence the room assignment office; get some action, when needed, from the maintenance department; and so on? These are not picayune items, as any program director will vouchsafe, and they are indeed relevant to the evaluation of a program's effectiveness.

Academic Criteria

The program director's main concern lies in fulfilling the needs of students, in ensuring that the legitimate purposes for which they enrolled in the program are met. The extent to which this aim is successfully accomplished is the measure of the program's success. And although the ultimate evaluation of student success is hardly susceptible of measurement, the process and organization upon which such success depends can be evaluated.

If there are no standard criteria, given the variations among programs, there are at least comparable elements among programs, and criteria upon which comparisons may be based. Are the number of hours in the program sufficient to involve the student to the extent that the goals require, without exceeding the limits of retentive learning? If a language laboratory is utilized (the efficacy of which is a moot issue), are the hours the students spend in the lab put to sufficiently profitable use—enough to warrant the lab's inclusion in the program?

Of great importance—is there a class placement system based on measurable criteria, articulated with a sufficient number of defined proficiency levels? Are the classroom hours so structured as to provide varying emphases on the four aspects of language, with sufficient

flexibility to meet the skewed deficiencies of different language groups and individual students within those groups? Are class schedules so constructed as to give each student a variety of teacher experiences? At any one level, is there articulation and coordination among the classes that focus on different aspects of language? And most important for evaluative purposes—how well does the system work? Is there a remedy for possible misplacement as well as flexibility for the occasional odd-bodd mix of proficiencies?

Is the material used in class, at each of the levels and in each of the aspects, appropriate, stimulating, and challenging? Are the texts up-to-date, relevant and usable by the students and teachers? Is there continual examination of new publications with the view to betterment of adoptions? Are teacher-created materials checked carefully for appropriateness?

How large is the faculty, and what is the average teacher/student ratio in the classes? Does the ratio differ by level or by language aspect? What is the proportion of full-time to part-time teachers? What is the full-time teaching load? The average load for part-timers? Are graduate assistants utilized as teachers? If so, how many in proportion to regular teachers? What are the graduate assistants' responsibilities, their permitted work load along with their study load?

What degrees do faculty hold, and how many years of relevant experience? How much direct academic supervision is given both full-time and part-time faculty? How much the graduate assistants? How much and what kind of orientation is given new faculty?

Is there a program-mandated teaching philosophy or methodology? If so, is it reviewed regularly, and by whom? How flexible is it? If there is no institutional approach, what are the limits, if any, to teachers' individual classroom autonomy? To what extent is the curriculum at any one level structured? To what degree may a teacher use his or her own judgment?

As to the students, how long, to what depth, and of what type is their orientation to their new environment? To what extent is there structured acculturation given by the classroom teacher? Is such acculturation part of the curriculum? What cultural activities and services are available on and off campus? Is there a "home hospitality" program, and how extensive is it?

Is there organized academic guidance and counseling? Is there a service to assist students in seeking admission to degree programs within the school/university or at other institutions, and to assist in completing application forms? Is the foreign student adviser an expert in Immigration and Naturalization Service matters, and are the foreign student adviser's services readily available to the students?

Evaluation III: The View of the Program's Faculty

Fiscal Criteria

The primary evaluation criterion from the faculty's standpoint is salary. Is it at comparable levels within the profession, within the institution, within the geographic area? This criterion applies to both full-timers and part-timers, as does the corollary—is the pay scale adequate to live on? Is there faculty input in the budget-making process?

What are the fringe benefits, if any, and do they apply to part-timers? Are there tuition benefits for all faculty, including part-timers? Is there a pension system, and to what extent is there institutional contribution, and is it available to part-time faculty? What is the absence-for-illness policy, in terms of make-up of cancelled classes, owed time, if any, and pay for substitutes? For the part-time instructor, is there pay deduction for absence-for-illness?

Administration Criteria

The faculty's concerns with the program administration fall into two areas, physical facilities and administrative duties. Are the physical facilities for the faculty adequate and comfortable? Are there personal desks and lockers, typing and duplicating facilities, private areas for consultations with students, and meeting rooms for shoptalk with colleagues? In short, is the environment conducive to an *esprit de corps?*

Is there a reasonable limit to administrative chores? Are instructions concerning such chores timely and clear? Is there a reasonable limit to the required "beyond the call of duty" volunteering?

Academic Criteria

Does the program administration make an effort to upgrade faculty skills? Are seminars organized for internal examination of new developments in the discipline? Are specialists invited to visit and to meet with the faculty? To what extent, if any, is there subsidization of expenses incurred in attendance at conferences? Is the program administration responsive to faculty suggestions and recommendations on academic issues?

Evaluation IV: The Student's View

Fiscal Criteria

The cost of tuition and fees is one criterion by which students evaluate an ESL program. Since many of the international students in some programs are not on scholarship funds, this criterion is important, especially for those who arrive in the U.S. with no firm commitment as to the location of academic study. Corollary to this issue is the cost

of living in the area of the ESL program. Inexpensive dormitory and board fees (especially the subsidized ones in state institutions) are highly valued by many students.

Administrative Criteria

The very first contact with the ESL program (often the first contact on the institution's campus) creates a lasting impression. Is the program office clean, attractive, well-appointed? Are the clerks friendly, warm, sympathetic, helpful? Does the FSA greet the students immediately and set their minds at rest about the many little problems they face?

What is the orientation program like? Is it clear? In what language/s is it given? What is the availability of a personal counselor, an academic adviser? What opportunities are there for meeting American students, for taking part in a home hospitality program? Are all the facilities of the campus, including sports, available to the students? Are there national clubs and an international club on campus?

The evaluation of an ESL program, to the international student, is very often in direct ratio to the extent of his homesickness. What opportunities are arranged for the newly arrived student to meet a fellow-countryman who has been on campus at least one school term? In general, a student's evaluation forms the basis for his input (of recommendation or condemnation) into the grapevine from the U.S. to his home country, and some ESL programs may very possibly fly or fail by the grapevine effect.

Academic Criteria

One must not downgrade the perceptiveness of the international student in academic concerns in the ESL classroom, even at the lowest level of proficiency. While they are often reluctant to come to a negative group attitude toward a teacher, when they do, their complaint (to another teacher, a coordinator, or the program director) must be taken seriously. On the other hand, general student evaluation of teacher performance is comparatively meaningless, especially when done in a formal manner through an anonymous questionnaire in which the nuances of descriptive adjectives such as "fair/good/very good" (or a scale from 1 to 5) are weighed. Various cultural differences obviate the validity of such evaluation, and, suspicious of the purposes of the forms, many students either refuse to participate, or pressured by their culture, often mark each item with an "outstanding" rating.

Evaluation V: The View from Outside the Program

One more facet of program evaluation must be touched on. Since all of the preceding discussion is premised on internal, or self-examination, mention must be made of evaluation by an individual or an agency

external to the program or institution. This type of evaluation might fall into one of two categories. First, there is that in which the institutional central administration requests an "outside expert evaluation" of its ESL program, much of the same sort that a regional accrediting board performs. The criteria given above, from all viewpoints and of all categories, would be relevant.

The second category is evaluation by an agency, private or governmental (usually foreign government), so that it might determine whether to send students to this, that, or the other ESL programs, or to continue to send students to any one program.

The desirability of such evaluation is obvious, but the criteria differ from most of the above. An agency looks at two issues: first, the welfare and comfort of its students, and second, the net results. As for the latter, it puts the reasonable question, "Have the students been well prepared for degree study?" One measurement applied by the agencies is the rapidity with which their students are accepted for full-time study after beginning the ESL program. But a danger accompanies this last measurement—admission to what kind of school, two- or four-year? Of what general quality and reputation and of what standards? With what extent of need for cash customers, regardless of preparation and qualifications?

Another measurement which some agencies apply is TOEFL, in terms of differentials between test scores over given periods of time, and in terms of the time required for the student to achieve a score of say, 500. While this is probably the only objective measurement currently available, it nonetheless lacks the elements of measurement of spoken English and the ability to write an extended piece of exposition. To these shortcomings must be added the possibility of a program's curriculum being focused on the taking of TOEFL rather than on language per se.

Conclusion

The reader, by now, must have noted that while numerous and varied criteria have been indicated—mostly in the form of questions—nothing has been stated concerning interpretation of the facts that the questions may elicit. This, naturally, has been deliberate. Interpretation of fact is always a matter of who is doing the interpreting, and for what purposes. There is no need to exemplify this. The readers know their own biases and will evaluate their programs from their own viewpoints and for their own purposes, to the extent their particular situations warrant.

Research

An ESL Administrator Looks at Research

Paul E. Munsell

If you are or can picture yourself as being an ESL administrator, considering the following possible options regarding research might help you focus more clearly on the issue:

1. The rest of the staff and I agree on what research needs to be done.
2. I have all the time and facilities needed to do good research.
3. I get meaningful and useful results from my research.
4. None of the above statements accurately characterizes my research.

It is likely that most administrators and program managers in intensive English programs would either choose "4" or would at least concede that to a large extent, one's administrative appointment portends the death of one's active scholarship. But is it really true that an ESL professional with heavy administrative duties does not or cannot do meaningful research? By defining research properly, the administrator may find that indeed there are many obvious ways in which to conduct useful research. For the purpose of this article, let us define research as those activities in which new and verifiable hypotheses are being used to predict or explain that information. In some research the emphasis is on *confirming* hypotheses. In other research, the emphasis is on *discovering* new information. In most cases, both discovery and explanation are important, the one supporting and stimulating the other. Given this definition, talking to students about personal problems or going to the library to read the latest research findings or compiling a list of textbooks is *not* research unless the information collected is conclusively synthesized, classified, related, or otherwise analyzed in a new way. On the other hand, many of an administrator's activities are, or could become, genuine

research activities, even if they are not consciously or even cautiously considered in that light, and he or she would need only add slightly to present responsibilities to make these activities of value to other professionals. For example, after a new textbook is used in class, its effects on students could be measured. If a new admissions procedure is instituted, its effects on reducing the number of late-arriving students could be determined. If a values-clarifying discussion with students is offered at the beginning of a term, the extent to which it affected attitudes and effort might be calculated. These are all examples of activities in which new, or newly arranged information leads to new, provable hypotheses, and thus represent valid research topics. By this definition, therefore, most administrators and program managers of various kinds are in fact constantly engaged in research. After all, they are constantly making decisions (hypotheses) based on information.

Objectively speaking, however, it may sometimes be the case that the ESL administrator does not in fact do as much research as he or she could or should, and it seems useful to review some reasons why not, before offering some recommendations on how to do more. The first reason for doing too little research is that administration and scholarship make almost opposite demands. An administrator must take a broad wide-angle, out-of-the-corner-of-the-eye view of activities in the program. A good researcher, in contrast, tends to focus more narrowly on specific features of a subject and exclude distracting considerations. An administrator must respond to events as they happen in the lives of others in the program, and as a result of these interruptions is left with small blocks of time that cannot even be accurately anticipated or planned for. A researcher, conversely, needs more extended periods of uninterrupted concentration and reflection. An administrator must be practical, while a researcher must indulge in ample speculation. The list could go on indefinitely, but the point should by now be clear that a good administrator who wants to do good research is going to have dual allegiances that may be difficult to balance.

The second reason administrators sometimes do not get the satisfaction of doing significant research is because it is their job to provide their clients with the goods and services which those clients have paid to receive. An intensive program really cannot reimburse students if a well-intentioned research project flops or shows negative results, and most professionals have qualms about sacrificing students on the research altar unless the students have willingly volunteered for that honor. But even when there are real research projects that would not jeopardize learning, it is often true that the students have not paid enough to make those projects affordable. We may never learn, alas, what the results might be of placing all students with families whose

members had received a year's training in ESL methods, or the results of having a one-to-one student-teacher ratio!

Third, some administrators untrained as researchers have difficulty dealing with the partial and incomplete nature of basic research studies. The sad truth is that research does not obviously or easily confirm or clarify the issues of greatest significance to the typical administrator, and thus, administrators are sometimes reluctant to follow up on the research of others because they are not convinced it will lead to conclusive outstanding results.

Finally, some administrators probably limit their research, or feel they have, because of the many theoretical uncertainties and quandaries in the ESL field. They do not always know where to start or whom to use as an authority. They vaguely suspect that any position taken will require extensive background study, and might be out of date or fashion before it receives the attention it properly deserves.

Some Recommendations for ESL Administrators on Doing Research

The following is a list of suggestions to which the reader can no doubt make valuable additions or modifications. After this list is another list of areas for fruitful research.

1. Always be actively involved in at least *one* important research project, even if you have to pay less attention to other seemingly necessary obligations. Valuable projects represent planned and scheduled commitments that can force you to reduce your involvement in other unplanned or unproductive assignments. Research responsibilities force you to learn and to study, provide intellectual stimulation, and generally provide a bit of a Hawthorn-effect boost to those involved. In the long run, the program, and you, will be better off.
2. Involve all related staff in discussing important issues about the program and select for research those topics that are central to those issues, that are of direct interest to those who will be working on them, and that will provide unequivocable and practical information to use in making program decisions. Make both the goals and the processes clear to all those involved.
3. Select projects for research that are of value to the intensive program and that are at the same time of theoretical interest. In this way, students will feel the research is directed at improving instruction while you are collecting data. For example, the theoretical issue of whether drill leads to communicative competence can be researched while still offering excellent teaching, *provided* you have one competent teacher who loves and believes in good drill and another teacher who is superior at guiding

communicative activities. If you have to force someone into "doing drills" or leading a "conversation group," you probably will not be doing anything practical, and to make matters worse, your research findings will not be very meaningful or conclusive. There are many good projects that can be done that have as a by-product the improvement of the day-to-day quality of the intensive program. We could measure the extent of avoidance, or fossilization, or ego permeability, or field dependence and so on while still offering excellent teaching.

4. Formalize the goals and procedures of your research as much as possible. That is, make the rewards and incentives, as well as the responsibilities and deadlines, clear for everyone involved. Staff members often have the disconcerting notion that you will do all the "wrapping up" on such projects, so if you are realistic, you will delegate the tabulating and reporting responsibilities *before* the project begins, be sure to give such helpers the professional recognition they have earned. Research does not always have to lead to publication or even to formal reports, but having the pressure to publish or to prepare a report does offer a useful incentive to do a complete job.
5. Use research methods that will be suitable for your project. If you are not sure of the appropriateness of your methods, consult with skilled researchers who can offer practical, sound advice. Avoid re-inventing the wheel—don't set off naively on something that many others have already done a lot of work on unless you have a meaningful contribution to make. Limit the project to what can realistically be accomplished in your program in the time allotted.
6. Relate your research interests and needs to those of other intensive English programs, and work cooperatively whenever possible. So much more can be done when people work together.
7. Find ways to reduce your load, and block out periods of time when you will not be interrupted, so that you have time and energy to do research. In other words, give the project the priority it deserves.
8. Be aware of the great diversity of goals, means, and results among all humans. For example, it is unlikely that research will ever uncover the "best" way to teach pronunciation or grammar, simply because each teacher is different, each class is different, and what might be "best" on one occasion is not necessarily going to be best on another. Not only is the desire for doctrinaire truth unrealistic, it is intimidating and inhibiting to those involved in the research. In a similar vein, there is no "best" way to do research. It is, in many ways, a creative activity. For example, one researcher may make valid new analyses from a large-group,

statistically based, control/experimental-group design. Another might make equally valuable hypotheses and conclusions by looking carefully at a small number of students—or even at just one. For example, to uncover the role of nonverbal communication, or of social distance, or of the acquisition of the past progressive, it might be more effective to study a few people in depth than to round up hundreds of test-happy subjects. Model building, with or without computer simulation, for example, can often lead to very practical and tangible results and should definitely be encouraged.

9. Keep or collect the kind of data that will serve in useful research projects. As a bare minimum, have the following information on file:

   a. Student data: Age, native language, previous experience in intensive English programs, educational aims, general performance as a student, test scores, marital status, local housing arrangements, source of sponsorship, and as much personal information as possible.
   b. Program data: Dates of attendance, class placement, names of teachers, texts used, attendance records, evaluation forms, and other records of methods, materials, experiments, and so on.

The following is a list of specific research areas and topics that might help provide a framework for useful research. The list is *not* arranged in the order of importance.

1. Content-related topics. A major research area deals with *what* we are trying to teach. This includes language, of course, but also a fast growing list of other subjects and skills our students need to learn, such as knowledge of the culture, nonverbal signals, communication strategies, academic content, a variety of skills, and so on. While we desperately need more information about the structure of language, about the way in which culture is organized and passed on, and about which communication strategies people use in different types of conversations, two factors must be kept in perspective. First, with so much knowledge already available, research in these areas—unless it is truly revolutionary—is not apt to lead to *major* breakthroughs in the quality of teaching activities. Look at how long linguists have been struggling to give valid analyses of English, and ask yourself if you have the time to join that valiant army. Second, meaningful research in these areas generally represents a very long-term commitment, and since others are busily engaged in such endeavors we must question the wisdom of competing with oth-

ers who have greater resources of time and money. You might better take a slightly different approach to research on content. You could ask, for example, what the *relationships* are between the content areas. What is the relationship, for example, among academic skills, communication strategies, culture, and language? This type of question does not duplicate other research to any great extent, it uses already familiar theoretical constructs, and it is directly related to the issue of training students for success in academic settings. Whatever you do, the broader view of the learner and not the narrower view of just one or another of the contents or skills the learner is mastering seems the wiser perspective.

2. Process-related questions. Another major area of research involves the learning or acquisition of the content mentioned above. Surprisingly little is known about the patterns or processes of language acquisition, and yet a virtual sea of data is available from which to draw new and interesting conclusions. For example, how is comprehension (input) acquired, how is it related to acquisition, and how and when does it lead to production (output)?
3. Student-related questions. There is a lot of folk wisdom and anecdotal information, as well as seemingly "scientific" information, about students, but surprisingly few verifiable *models* of the data. How are students really different from each other? What are the interaction effects of content, process, teacher, and program on the individual students? How can students' *real* feelings and processes be measured *as* they learn?
4. Teacher-centered questions. While more appears to be known about teachers than about students (since researchers can use themselves as primary case studies), still too little is known. Many have despaired, for example, in defining what a "good" teacher is, or how a person can be trained to be one. There would seem to be, therefore, many valuable projects that could spin off from attempts to improve the quality of teaching in intensive programs.
5. Program-centered questions. The structure of programs, the way records are kept and used, admissions standards, tuition rates, and a host of other topics are ripe for simple yet important research projects. What kinds of students does the program attract, and why? Do other intensive programs have similar or different populations, and what is the effect? Should a program standardize its classes and methods, or is variety in teaching styles preferable? If the students are given an opportunity to discuss their expectations in light of the program's procedures at the beginning of the course, do they adjust better? What curricular changes most affect the amount of learning? And so on and on.

To summarize, research is worthwhile *if* properly chosen, tied to the needs of the program, conducted with the willing cooperation and understanding of the staff and students, and aimed at useful and meaningful research questions that have the potential of making teaching and learning more effective and satisfying.

Contributors

Paul J. Angelis is associate professor of linguistics and chairman of the department of linguistics at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. He was program director of language programs at Educational Testing Service from 1977 to 1981 and was a member of the NAFSA Task Force on Standards and Responsibilities. His teaching specialties are language testing, contrastive linguistics, and language teaching methodology.

Ralph Pat Barrett is an associate professor of English and a former director of the English Language Center at Michigan State University. He has served as chair of CIEP, ESL consultant for the NAFSA Field Service Program, and ATESL national team member as well as in various ATESL positions at the state, regional, and national level. His overseas assignments as an adviser/consultant include Japan, Thailand, Saudi Arabia, Mexico, and England. Currently he is involved in ESL test development, teaching, and applications of computer technology to ESL instruction.

Allis R. Bens, retired director of the American Language Institute, San Francisco State University, has worked in ESL/EFL since 1954. She is a past chairman of ATESL, CIEP, and the Cooperative Projects Committee of NAFSA. She was a Fulbright teacher in Japan, received a Japan Foundation grant, and co-directed several shipboard orientation programs for IIE and American President Lines. Bens was a member of the TOEFL Committee of Examiners and conducted a gains study for ETS. She has authored a number of publications in the ESL/EFL field. Since her retirement she has taught an ESL class at Merritt College, Oakland, California, and is currently an administrative consultant for the California Language Academy, Berkeley, California.

Richard L. Daesch is an instructor and administrative director at the Center for English as a Second Language at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. He was an ESL consultant for the NAFSA Field Ser-

vice Program from 1974 to 1977 and is currently consulting for the program on a substitute basis. Daesch has been an administrator in intensive English programs since 1964 and has been involved in numerous ESL/EFL projects and programs during this period.

Robert F. Dakin is an associate professor of linguistics and English at Ohio University, Athens, Ohio. He received a Ph.D. in English linguistics and education from the University of Michigan, where he was associated with the English Language Institute from 1955 to 1967. In 1967 he established the Ohio Program of Intensive English and was director of that program until 1980. He is currently involved with teaching, research, and materials and curriculum development at the department of linguistics and the OPIE.

Rebecca G. Dixon, assistant professor of English as a second language and director of the Intensive English Institute at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has directed several special ESL programs at the University of Illinois and taught English in Japan from 1948 to 1960. Within NAFSA, she has served as chair of ATESL, chair of CIEP, and member of the NAFSA Board.

David E. Eskey, associate professor of English as a second language, and director of the American Language Institute, University of Southern California, has been involved in ESL as a teacher, scholar, and administrator both in the U.S. and abroad—at USC, the University of Pittsburgh, the Middle East (Iraq and Lebanon), and the Far East (Thailand). His special interest has been the teaching of second-language reading.

Shigeo Imamura, former associate professor of English and past director of the English Language Center at Michigan State University, is now the director of English, Interdisciplinary College for International Studies, Aoyama Gakuin University, Tokyo. The author of numerous textbooks and articles on ESL, he has taught and lectured in Japan, the United States, and several other countries around the world.

William E. Longenecker is currently pursuing his doctorate in education at the University of Texas-Austin. He was the director of the English Language Institute at Oregon State University from 1973 to 1981. He also served as acting assistant director of the testing and publication divisions of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan. Longenecker is a former Peace Corps volunteer (1968–71, Thailand). More recently he has served as an ESL consultant for the NAFSA Field Service Program, a member of the TOEFL Committee of Examiners for ETS, and parliamentarian of TESOL.

Paul E. Munsell, associate professor of English at the English Language Center, Michigan State University, was assistant director of the ELC from 1970 to 1975 and director from 1975 to 1980. He was involved in research and testing during much of this time as well as in materials development, teaching, and other theoretical studies. He has also taught overseas in Japan, Argentina, and Mexico.

Milton G. Saltzer joined the faculty of the American Language Institute of New York University in 1958. He held administrative positions, was a professor of ESL, and became director of the ALI in 1974. Since his retirement in 1979 he has been a full-time member of the faculty of the ALI. He has written several programs for specialized audiences overseas and has served as lecturer and adviser to ESL programs across the country on both administrative and academic concerns.

Joseph H. Sheehan is the director of the Language Laboratory of the Language and Culture Center of the University of Houston in Texas as well as an instructor in the ESL program. He has been an assistant professor of EFL at New York University and Georgetown University and assistant director of the American Language Institute of NYU. He also served as director of Language Learning Technology at Georgetown University. He has been a consultant on language labs for governments and schools both in the U.S. and abroad. He is the current president of the National Association of Learning Laboratory Directors. His publications involve educational technology and language learning.

Barry P. Taylor is director of the English Program for Foreign Students at the University of Pennsylvania. He has presented papers and published articles on a wide range of both theoretical and pedagogical topics. He served for over five years on the Editorial Advisory Board of the *TESOL Quarterly*, was member-at-large of the NAFSA/ATESL national team, and is currently a member of the executive committee of TESOL.